

HERTFORDSHIRE
COUNTY COUNCIL



COUNTY LIBRARY

Book No.

Class No.

500293

873/VIR

Form L.10.

60293

N.F. 873/VIR

the

Q



14 OCT 2003

Please renew/return this item by the last date shown.

So that your telephone call is charged at local rate,
please call the numbers as set out below:

From Area codes
01923 or 020:

From the rest of Herts:

Renewals: 01923 471373

01438 737373

Enquiries: 01923 471333

01438 737333

Textphone: 01923 471599

01438 737599

L32

www.hertsdirect.org/librarycatalogue



THE GROWTH OF THE AENEID

UNIFORM WITH THIS BOOK

6s. net.

"Excellent Virgilian Studies."—*The Times*.

BY W. WARDE FOWLER

Virgil's Gathering of the Clans : Aeneid VII.

Aeneas at the Site of Rome : Aeneid VIII.
The Death of Turnus : Aeneid XII.

BY T. F. ROYDS

Virgil and Isaiah : A Study of the Pollio.
The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil :
A Naturalist's Handbook to the
Georgics.

BY J. SARGEAUNT

The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil.

BY PROF. H. E. BUTLER

The Sixth Book of the Aeneid. 12s. net.
[In Preparation]

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL

THE GROWTH OF THE AENEID

*A Study of the Stages of Composition as
revealed by the Evidences of Incompletion.
Being a Thesis approved for the Degree of
Master of Arts in the University of London*

By

M. MARJORIE CRUMP, M.A.

LATE OF ST. HUGH'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

LECTURER IN LATIN AT GOLDSMITHS' COLLEGE, LONDON

OXFORD
BASIL BLACKWELL

1920



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY - - - - -	I
II. THE PRESENT FORM OF THE AENEID: I.-VI. -	16
1. THE PROBLEM OF III. - - - - -	16
2. I., II., AND VI. - - - - -	41
3. THE SOURCES OF IV. - - - - -	52
4. THE RELATION OF V. TO THE OTHER BOOKS -	63
III. THE PRESENT FORM OF THE AENEID: VII.-XII. -	76
IV. THE STAGES OF COMPOSITION - - - - -	100
INDEX OF PASSAGES QUOTED FROM THE WORKS OF VERGIL - - - - -	120
INDEX - - - - -	122

The Growth of the Aeneid

No study of Vergil can be complete which does not treat the Aeneid primarily as a great work of art. Though many imperfections and inconsistencies remain in the poem, yet the unity and artistic value of Vergil's conception are not affected by the want of final revision. Indeed, on a first reading of the Aeneid the inconsistencies either pass unnoticed or are dismissed as unimportant; it is only a close study that reveals the problems which abound in all parts of the poem, ranging from such obvious difficulties as the attribution of the same prophecy first to Celaeno and then to Anchises, to the more obscure questions involved in the interpretation of single lines or the choice between variant readings.

There is very little external evidence dealing with the composition of the Aeneid; but all the ancient Lives are in agreement on one point—namely, that Vergil died before he could complete his revision, and that on his death-bed he wished to destroy the manuscript. In the Life prefixed to the Commentary of Donatus, and now generally attributed to Suetonius,¹ the following account is given:

“Anno aetatis quinquagesimo secundo impositurus Aeneidi summam manum statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere, triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare, ut reliqua vita tantum philosophiae vacaret.² . . . Egerat cum Vario priusquam Italia decederet ut si quid sibi accidisset

¹ Cf. Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil*, pp. 28-31.

² Sueton., 35.

Introductory

Aeneida combureret; at is facturum se pernegarat. Igitur in extrema valetudine assidue scrinia desideravit crematurus ipse; verum nemine offerente nihil quidem nominatim de ea cavit, ceterum eidem Vario ac simul Tuccae scripta sua sub ea condicione legavit ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset."¹

What the actual condition of the manuscript was it is impossible to say with certainty. There is some evidence for supposing that it was not a fair copy, but one which had been to some extent corrected. Servius in his *Life of Vergil* states that Varius and Tucca removed the lines about Helen from Book II., and both Suetonius and Servius mention the removal of the four lines originally prefixed to the beginning of Book I.² It is inconceivable that Varius and Tucca should have tampered with Vergil's text; in fact, they had received strict instructions to change nothing. They must therefore have found these passages struck out in the manuscript; there were probably other corrections of the same kind of which no record has survived.

On the other hand, there are many indications that the *Aeneid*, as we have it, does not represent the first draft of the poem. The external evidence

¹ Sueton., 39-40.

² "Unde et semiplenos eius invenimus versiculos, ut 'hic cursus fuit' et aliquos detractos, ut in principio; nam ab armis non coepit, sed sic 'Ille ego,' etc. . . . et in secundo hos versus constat esse detractos—'Iamque adeo,' etc." (Serv., *in Vita Verg.*). "Nisus grammaticus audisse se a senioribus aiebat Varium . . . primi libri correxisse principium his versibus demptis 'Ille ego,' etc." (Sueton., 42).

The Growth of the Aeneid

is scanty and does not give much definite information on this point, but there is no reason to doubt the statement of Suetonius that the Aeneid was first sketched out in prose, and that Vergil afterwards wrote "*prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens.*"¹ This is borne out by the fact that many of the difficulties and inconsistencies, especially in the earlier books, can only be explained on the supposition of an earlier version, of which the traces have not been entirely eliminated.

It may be assumed, therefore, that there were at least three stages of composition. Of these the prose sketch was the first. Apart from the evidence of Suetonius, it is only reasonable to suppose that Vergil planned the framework before beginning to write; and, as the story was long and complicated, a written sketch was practically indispensable.

Of the second stage we have no definite knowledge, except that the Aeneid was not necessarily written in its present order. Vergil probably began with the earlier books, collecting his material in the form of a large number of longer or shorter detached passages, which were gradually fitted into the poem. Such passages probably occur in all parts of the Aeneid, but it seems that Vergil also followed the order of his prose sketch in dealing with each book as a whole. As the work proceeded the original plan was considerably modified; as the poet realized the possibilities of his subject, and grew more confident of his power of handling it, he broke away

¹ Sueton., 23.

Introductory

from tradition, and allowed his imagination free play. Thus, as the poem grew, inconsistencies crept in; while new incidents were introduced, or new conceptions adopted, the older work was left untouched or was only partially removed.

The third stage is represented by the present text of the *Aeneid*. We have no means of knowing whether an earlier version existed in any form approaching a continuous whole. The present text may be the form in which all the separate parts were first united, or, as is more likely, a partial revision of some earlier text. It seems probable that the arrangement is Vergil's own, for he evidently regarded the poem as needing revision rather than completion. In the case of the Third Book, however, all the evidence points to the conclusion that he intended to rewrite the story of the wanderings of Aeneas in a very different form.

Assuming these three stages, we are confronted with the following problem: How far is it possible to reconstruct the original plan of the *Aeneid* and the modifications through which it passed?

On such a question it is, of course, impossible to dogmatize; but, by studying and sifting the internal evidence, it is possible to arrive at a reconstruction which is consistent both with the scanty external evidence and with probability in general. In dealing with evidence of this kind, certain points must be observed.

I. Single inconsistencies in narration prove nothing in themselves; they may be mere slips of

The Growth of the Aeneid

memory. Such slips occur in almost any narrative.¹ In the Aeneid a good instance may be found in the two passages dealing with the spoils taken by Turnus from the body of Pallas; in X. 495-500 he takes only the belt; in XI. 91-2 he has everything except the spear and helmet. But where a passage or series of passages is at variance with the whole, then the inconsistency must be carefully considered. It is important to note that almost all the serious difficulties arise in connection with the Third Book.

2. It is clear that in many cases lines or whole passages must have been removed. Such passages may have left a trace in the text, and in a few cases have actually survived, the most important instance being the well-known lines about Helen in II. But in the great majority of cases it is impossible to detect an excision.²

¹ There is a typical case in the *Divina Commedia*. In *Inferno* XX. 55 Manto is mentioned among the diviners of the Eighth Circle; in *Purgatorio* XXII. 113 Vergil mentions her as being in Limbo.

² To realize the truth of this it is only necessary to compare any poem of which we actually possess two versions. In the 1798 and 1803 editions of Landor's *Gebir*, the poem begins as follows:

When old Silenus called the Satyrs home,
Satyrs the tender-hooft and ruddy-horn'd,
With Bacchus and the nymphs, he sometimes rose
Amidst the tale or pastoral, and show'd
The light of purest wisdom; and the god
Scattered with wholesome fruit the pleasant plains.
Ye woody hills of Cambria! and ye hills
That hide in heaven your summits and your fame,

Introductory

Again, there can be no certainty with regard to inserted passages, unless they absolutely break the narrative, or are inconsistent with the part of the poem in which they occur. Even so, great caution must be exercised in drawing conclusions. Heinze puts forward a defence of the theory that the Laocoon episodes (II. 40-56 and 199-233) are a later insertion. These two passages actually do break in with some abruptness, and the second ends in an unfinished line, so that there is considerable support for the theory; but there must be many passages which have been so skilfully inserted that no trace remains.

3. It is essential to remember that Vergil is habitually clear and accurate in expression. He always knows what he means and can convey it in language which is all the more beautiful because every word is used with definite intention. Again, the tradition of the text is singularly good, and in most cases the variant readings are of little importance to the interpretation. The critic is never reduced to the necessity of ruthlessly altering the text in order to extract something approaching to sense.

Your ancient songs and breezes pure invite
Me from my noontide rambles, and the force
Of high example influences my lay.
I sing the fates of Gebir. . . .

The 1831 edition begins, "I sing the fates of Gebir," thus affording a close parallel to the opening of the Aeneid. In both cases the original opening has been discarded, and in neither case could anyone have suspected it if the lines had not been preserved.

The Growth of the Aeneid

Consequently, the finished poems are marked throughout by accurate thought and clear expression. But this clearness and this accuracy are the result of long and careful revision. Vergil was accustomed to dictate a certain number of verses every day, and then spend a considerable time in polishing them.¹ It may, then, be fairly assumed that all cases of real obscurity in the Aeneid either prove that the passage in question is unfinished, or that certain lines, inconsistent with the later version, have survived from an earlier draft. If, in addition to obscurity of sense, variant readings exist, it is probable that the editors were unable to understand Vergil's manuscript, either because the variants already existed in it or because the clue to the meaning of the passage was lacking.²

Something must be said about the bearing of the unfinished lines on the question. The ancient commentators considered them to be signs of in-

¹ "Cum Georgica scriberet, traditur cotidie meditados mane plurimos versus dictare solitus, ac per totum diem retractando ad paucissimos redigere, non absurde carmen se ursae more parere dicens et lambendo demum effingere" (Sueton., 22).

² There are very few cases of combined obscurity of sense and reading in the Aeneid. The most famous crux is that of IV. 436: "Quam mihi cum dederis (dederit) cumulatam (cumulata) morte remittam." Servius states that "dederis" was the reading of Varius and Tucca. If this is correct the line is unintelligible, unless we suppose that it refers to some passage which has disappeared. Both readings may have existed in Vergil's manuscript, but the editors evidently understood the words no better than modern scholars do.

Introductory

completion,¹ and do not seem to have recognized the possibility of any other view. It is rather a modern theory that some lines have been left unfinished to relieve the monotony of the hexameter, or to produce such an effect as is conveyed in oratory by aposiopesis. This view has been adopted by many famous scholars and is at first sight very plausible. But if the facts of the case are analyzed, the evidence seems rather to support the statements of ancient criticism.²

Vergil did not require to vary his metre by such a device, because his complete mastery of the hexameter was sufficient to prevent monotony. It is, however, true that occasionally the unfinished lines are extraordinarily effective. We could not wish for any alteration in such lines as—

Infelix qui non sponsae praecepta furentis
Audierit !³

¹ Sueton., 41. Serv., in *Vita Verg.*

² Apart from the testimony of Suetonius and Servius, who both expressly mention the unfinished lines as signs of incompleteness, such lines are not paralleled in the work of any ancient poet. It is inconceivable that some examples should not be found in the work of Vergil's imitators, if he himself had recognized the use of half-lines as a poetical device. Nor do unfinished lines occur to any extent in modern poetry. It is true that they can be very effective in drama; cf. Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, II. 1:

I see thee yet, in form as palpable
As this which now I draw.

Thou marshall'st me the way that I was going.

But in lyric and epic poetry they are out of place.

³ II. 345-6.

The Growth of the Aeneid

or—

Tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
Proice tela manu, sanguis meus !¹

But what is the particular effect of—

Rex prior haec :²

or—

Cui Liger ?³

Moreover, if the effect was intentional, why has Vergil so often finished a line which, on such an assumption, would have been more effective unfinished ? Such a case occurs in Book I. :

Dixit et avertens rosea cervice refulsit,
Ambrosiaque comae divinum vertice odorem
Spiravere ; pedes vestis defluxit ad imos ;
Et vera incessu patuit dea. Ille ubi matrem
Agnovit tali fugientem est voce secutus. ⁴

“ Et vera incessu patuit dea ” would be much more effective without the following words, and the hiatus, though it can be defended by other examples,⁵ is a very violent one. If Vergil ever intentionally left lines unfinished, we should have expected this to be one of them.

Vergil is, in fact, very fond of a considerable pause in the middle of a line, and uses it frequently

¹ VI. 834-5.

² VIII. 469.

³ X. 580.

⁴ I. 402-406.

⁵ Cf. Ecl. II. 53: “ Addam cerea pruna (honus erit huic quoque pomo) ”; and Aen. XII. 648: “ Sancta ad vos anima atque istius inscia culpae,” where two MSS. read “ nescia ”—an obvious correction on the part of an interpolator. The hiatus in I. 405 may be in imitation of Homer.

Introductory

with great effect. The exordium to Book II. is a typical example:

Sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
Et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem,
Quamquam animus meminisse horret luctuque refugit,
Incipiam.

Fracti bello fatisque repulsi, etc.¹

Probably some of the unfinished lines, especially those which occur at the end of a passage, are due to this partiality for a middle-line pause. In these cases the passage has been written separately and joined to the following lines.² Such half-lines, as might be expected, are usually effective. The conclusion of the second Laocoon episode affords a striking example:

Ducendum ad sedes simulacrum orandaque divae
Numina conclamant.³

In eight cases⁴ a speech is concluded by an unfinished line, and it may be noted that many speeches end in the middle of a finished line.

¹ Cf. also VII. 45 and VI. 886, where, as is shown in Professor R. S. Conway's "Essay on the Structure of Aeneid VI." (*Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway on his Sixtieth Birthday*, Cambridge, 1913), the last word of the speech is carried over into the next line "to avoid the sound of completeness, to break off the rhythm and leave the reader unsatisfied."

² R. Sabbadini (*Il primitivo disegno dell' Eneide*, Torino, 1900) regards the unfinished lines as giving evidence of late inserted work. This must undoubtedly be so in some cases, but it is quite unnecessary to suppose it in all.

³ II. 232-3.

⁴ II. 720; IV. 361; V. 815; VII. 248, 455; X. 284, 876; XI. 375.

The Growth of the Aeneid

In seven cases¹ the unfinished line is of the type—

Tum sic effatur:²

introducing or standing at the end of a speech. This type, with the single exception of V. 653, occurs only in VIII.—XII. We may suppose that these lines are mere notes to show that another line was required. Vergil does not follow the example of Homer in prefixing the same line again and again to different speeches, but prefers to vary his mode of expression. It would therefore be quite natural to note that such a line was required, and to wait until a suitable one should suggest itself.

An unfinished line may also be due to the omission of a passage, but on this point it is impossible to draw conclusions with any certainty.³

The distribution of these lines is of great interest. They occur in every book with varying frequency, but it may be noted that on the whole the books or portions of books, in which a large proportion occurs, show other signs of incompleteness. VI. and XII. are almost entirely free from them; III., which is generally acknowledged to have lacked revision more than any other book, contains seven. The most interesting case is that of II., in which only four occur between lines 1 and 566, while there are six between 567 and 804. The first of these two divisions is one of the most finely finished parts

¹ V. 653; VIII. 469; IX. 295; X. 17, 490, 580; XII. 631.

² IX. 295.

³ VI. 94 and 835 may be due to omission. See pp. 49 ff.

Introductory

of the whole poem; the second is much less carefully revised.

The evidence supplied by the unfinished lines, taken in conjunction with other marks of incompleteness, is therefore of importance in deciding the relative completeness of different parts of the *Aeneid*—a question which has an important bearing on the main problem.

It is necessary here to mention the theory put forward by Alfred Gercke in his *Entstehung der Aeneis*,¹ that the last six books of the *Aeneid* are earlier than the first six. It is unnecessary to discuss his argument in detail, as the evidence for regarding III. as the earliest book and for assigning an early date to I. and IV. seems conclusive.

The second half of the *Aeneid* contains far fewer difficulties and inconsistencies than the first half; but this is easily accounted for if we remember that the subject of these books has more natural unity. Moreover, as the composition of the poem proceeded, Vergil's conception and constructive power developed. It is exactly in the earlier parts of an unrevised poem that we should expect to find inconsistencies, especially where the poet breaks free from the accepted legends and uses his imagination. The plot is sketched out and the work begun; at first progress is slow, the poet distrusts his own powers, and only continues under strong persuasion.² But

¹ *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, Alfred Gercke (Berlin, 1913).

² "Ego vero frequentes a te litteras accipio. . . . De Aenea quidem meo, si mehercle iam dignum auribus haberem

The Growth of the Aeneid

gradually the story evolves itself, and the poet finds new conceptions and new incidents. Sometimes he eliminates the older conception entirely; at other times he leaves it untouched, or allows some traces of it to survive; but with every day's work the end grows clearer; and when he has reached the end he will go back and bring all the earlier work into harmony with the rest. That is the history of the Aeneid as revealed both by external evidence and by the poem itself.

NOTE ON THE UNFINISHED LINES.—The metre in the case of the unfinished lines cannot be taken as evidence for or against the theory of a metrical device. The break occurs at almost every possible place; it is naturally most common at the strong caesura of the third or fourth foot; thirty-five of the fifty-eight examples are broken here. In fourteen cases the break occurs in the second foot, once after the second syllable of a dactyl.¹ There are five which are broken at the end of the fourth foot, all of them ending in a dactyl, and three at the end of the first foot. One only is broken after the second foot (a dactyl). This line, "*Hic cursus fuit*," occurs in the First Book, and it is interesting to notice that

tuis, libenter mitterem, sed tanta inchoata res est, ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar, cum praesertim, ut scis, alia quoque studia ad id opus multoque potiora impertiar" (Letter of Vergil to Augustus; Macrobius, Sat. I., 24, 11).

¹ "*Haec effata*" (V. 653). "*Effatus*" and "*effata*" occur several times in this position and are always scanned — — ∪.

Introductory

such a pause is fairly frequent in the First Book, but rare in the others. These pauses are found in finished lines in about the same proportion. Thus, if the effect was intentional, Vergil varied it as much as possible; while if he left the lines unfinished they were broken off at the natural stops.

CHAPTER II

THE PRESENT FORM OF THE AENEID: I.-VI.

I. THE PROBLEM OF III.

THE whole question of the composition of the Aeneid primarily turns on the original relation of the Third Book to the rest of the poem. Even a superficial study shows that almost all the important problems have their origin in III. Some events are mentioned as having taken place during the seven years' wandering, while no trace of them is found in III.; others, which we are told in III., recur in a different form without any suggestion of repetition. Yet III. is complete in itself, and when read apart from the rest of the poem gives a perfectly clear and connected account of the wanderings of Aeneas between Troy and Sicily. But when it is read as a part of the whole, it is at once obvious that either III. or a large number of passages in I., II., and IV.-VIII. would have undergone substantial alteration in the final revision.

The problem of the Third Book is a double one: it is inconsistent with the account of the wanderings of Aeneas as given in the other books, and its general

The Present Form of the Aeneid

artistic value is considerably less than that of the rest of the poem.

The first part of this problem has been dealt with very fully, and with very varying results. It has been claimed that III. is the oldest part of the Aeneid,¹ that it is earlier than I., II., and IV.-VI., but later than VII.-XII.,² and that it is at least later than any other book except IX.-XII.³ For the fact of its lower artistic value various reasons have been alleged; but it has not been generally observed that we have here, not two problems, but two aspects of the same problem, and the second aspect is not less important than the first.

It is necessary first to examine the inconsistencies in narrative between III. and the rest of the Aeneid.

1. In III. the Trojans set out without any knowledge of their destination;⁴ they do not even know the name of the country in which they are to settle. As the voyage continues they learn little by little where they are going. First they are told to seek their ancient mother;⁵ then, after the vain attempt at colonization in Crete, Aeneas for the first time hears the names Hesperia, Ausonia, and Italy from the Penates.⁶ The prophecy of the Penates is confirmed by an ancient prophecy of Cassandra⁷ remembered by Anchises, which, as Gercke rightly

¹ By Nettleship.

² By Gercke.

³ By Heinze.

⁴ "Incerti quo fata ferant, ubi sistere detur" (III. 7).
"Quem sequimur? quove ire iubes? ubi ponere sedes?" (III. 88).

⁵ III. 94-96.

⁶ III. 163-171.

⁷ III. 182-188.

The Growth of the Aeneid

shows,¹ had been forgotten, because of the universal discredit attaching to Cassandra's words. Here there is no inconsistency between the existence of a former oracle and the ignorance of the Trojans. Finally, the full details of the voyage as far as Cumae are given in the prophecy of Helenus.² Latium is never mentioned; Tiber only once, and by Aeneas—

Si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva
Intraro.³

This is a curious passage, as Aeneas has not heard the name Tiber in any prophecy given in III.; and, as has already been pointed out, he knows nothing except what is contained in these prophecies. It may be concluded that 495–505 is a later addition to this book, inserted after the end of II. was written. It is generally agreed that Creusa's prophecy is later than III.; in that prophecy occurs the line—

Longa tibi exsilia et vastum maris aequor arandum.⁴

In III. 495 there is a direct reference to this line in

Vobis partita quies; nullum maris aequor arandum;

and the Tiber and its cornfields are mentioned in both passages. We have, then, here an inserted passage harmonizing with the conception of II., but not with that of III.

In other books than III. the Trojans know the names of Italy, Latium, and Tiber from the beginning, having learnt them from oracles received before

¹ *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, p. 35. ² III. 374–462.

³ III. 500–501.

⁴ II. 780.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

their departure from Asia. The prophecy of Creusa has already been mentioned:

Longa tibi exsilia et vastum maris aequor arandum,
Et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
Inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris:
Illic res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx
Parta tibi.¹

Again, in IV. 345-6 we find:

Sed nunc Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo,
Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortes.

This can only refer to an oracle received in Asia. Latium is mentioned in I. 205 by Aeneas; in 554 by Ilioneus; and in IV. 432 by Dido:² the name of Tiber occurs in Creusa's prophecy, and in V. 83:

Non licuit finis Italos fataliaque arva
Nec tecum Ausonium quicumque est, quaerere Thybrim.

2. In III. the geographical details of the voyage are described with great clearness, and this applies not only to the earlier part of the journey, when the Trojans were still in known waters, but also to the voyage along the Italian coast.³ From the first sight of Italy there is no uncertainty; even the

¹ II. 780-784.

² H. T. Karsten ("De Aeneidis, Libro III.," *Hermes*, 1904, p. 262) notes that, excluding II., Latium is mentioned in every book except III. and IX., and Latinus (populus) in every book except III. and IV.

³ "Iamque rubescebat stellis Aurora fugatis
Cum procul obscuros collis humilemque videmus
Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant" (III. 521-524).

Cf. also 548-569 and 692-708.

The Growth of the Aeneid

names of the coast towns and the legends connected with them are accurately known.

Elsewhere, though the Trojans know the name of their destination, they are uncertain of its position.¹ There is an atmosphere rather suggesting that of *Odyssey* IX.-XII., a sense of wandering in an uncharted sea, not the familiar Mediterranean of *Aeneid* III. This atmosphere does not depend on any definite passages, but is conveyed by the feeling of the whole. V. 83 has already been quoted:

Nec tecum Ausonium, quicumque est, quaerere Thybrim :
and when we read such lines as—

Dum per mare magnum
Italiam sequimur fugientem et volvimur undis,²

it is difficult to realize that Italy is a country whose coast is quite familiar, and that the Trojans have even made a landing upon it. It is rather the promised land, greatly desired, but often despaired of.

3. In three cases there is a discrepancy between the account of a prophecy in III. and its fulfilment in a later book. In III. 247-257 is given the

¹ Heinze (*Virgils epische Technik*, c. ii., p. 84) quotes the story told by Herodotus (IV. 150) of the people of Thera, who were bidden to found a colony in Libya, a land of whose position they were entirely ignorant.

² V. 628-9. Cf. VI. 61—

Iam tandem Italiae fugientis prendimus oras,
and IV. 311-2—

Quid, si non arva aliena domosque
Ignotas peteres, et Troia antiqua maneret.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

prophecy of Celaeno that the Trojans shall indeed reach Italy:

Sed non ante datam cingetis moenibus urbem
Quam vos dira fames nostraeque iniuria caedis
Ambesas subigat malis absumere mensas.¹

This speech causes consternation among the Trojans, until Aeneas is told by Helenus that the Fates will provide for the future.

This prophecy is fulfilled in VII., where Aeneas and his followers eat the cakes on which they have laid their fruit; Ascanius cries: "Heus, etiam mensas consumimus."²

Aeneas welcomes the omen, and quotes the words which Anchises had once spoken:³

Cum te, nate, fames ignota ad litora vectum
Accisis coget dapibus consumere mensas,
Tum sperare domos defessus, ibique memento
Prima locare manu molirique aggere tecta.⁴

The eating of the tables, then, is the sign that the goal is reached, and this account is in accordance with the form of the legend given by Dionysius Halicarnasensis,⁵ in which the same prophecy is given by an oracle at Dodona or in Asia.

¹ III. 255-257.

² VII. 116.

³ Karsten attempts to remove the discrepancy by supposing that Vergil intended the reader to infer that Anchises had revealed to Aeneas the meaning of Celaeno's prophecy. But even so we should expect some reference to Celaeno.

⁴ VII. 124-127.

⁵ Ἦν γάρ τι θέσφατον αὐτοῖς, ὥς μὲν τινες λέγουσιν ἐν Δωδώνῃ γενόμενον, ὥς δ' ἕτεροι γράφουσιν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ χέρσῳ τῆς Ἰδῆς, ἔνθα ᾠκει Σίβυλλα ἐπιχωρία νύμφη χρησμοδός, ἣ αὐτοῖς ἔφρασε πλεῖν ἐπὶ

The Growth of the Aeneid

The second discrepancy occurs in the two applications of the sign of the white sow with the thirty little pigs. In III.¹ Helenus declares it to be the sign of the place where Aeneas shall build his city. In VIII. Tiber tells Aeneas of the same sign in the same words, and adds that after thirty years Ascanius shall found Alba Longa on the spot where the white sow first appears with her litter of thirty.²

There is a third difficulty also occurring in the prophecy of Helenus. He tells Aeneas to consult the Cumaean Sibyl, and adds the words—

Illa tibi Italiae populos venturaque bella
Et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem
Expedit, cursusque dabit venerata secundos.³

In VI. the Sibyl gives a short prophecy in very general terms, but does not name any of the Italian races nor suggest to Aeneas any course of action.⁴ It is Anchises who gives the promised revelation—

Bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda
Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,
Et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem.⁵

δυσμῶν ἡλίου, τέως ἂν εἰς τοῦτο τὸ χωρίον ἔλθωσιν ἐν ᾧ κατέδονται τὰς τραπέζας (Dion. H., I. 55). Cf. Serv., in *Aen.* III. 256: "Ut Varro in secundo divinarum dicit oraculum hoc a Dodonaco Iove apud Epirum acceperunt." The attribution of this oracle to Celaeno seems to be Vergil's own.

¹ III. 389-393.

² VIII. 43-48. 46 seems to have been interpolated from III. 393. Here also the later account is in harmony with that of Dionysius: Μετὰ δὲ τοσούτους ἐνιαυτοὺς ὅσους ἂν ἡ ὕς τέκη χοίρους κτισθήσεται πρὸς τῶν ἐξ ἐκείνου γεννησομένων πόλιν ἐτέραν εὐδαίμονα καὶ μεγάλην. . . . τῇ δ' ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ τριάκοντα λέγεται χοίρους ἡ ὕς ἐκτεκεῖν (Dion. H., I. 56).

³ III. 458-460.

⁴ VI. 83-94.

⁵ VI. 890-892.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

4. There is scarcely any reference to the wrath of Juno in III. Helenus mentions her twice: first when he couples her with the Fates as forbidding him to tell too much,¹ and later when he advises Aeneas to propitiate her above all the gods.² There is nothing here to suggest that her wrath is the main cause of all the sufferings of the Trojans. Yet after the forcible statement in I. 25-28—

Necdum etiam causae irarum sacvique dolores
Exciderant animo; manet alia mente repostum
Iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
Et genus invisum et rapti Ganymedis honores—

we should expect to find her playing a more important part.

5. Aeneas in his own account of his wanderings refers constantly to Apollo and his oracles as having guided him. The first oracle is given at Delos,³ and it is Apollo who sends the Penates to interpret it after the unsuccessful attempt at colonization in Crete.⁴ Celaeno prophesies in the name of Phoebus,⁵ and Helenus is inspired by him. Finally, it is to the temple of Apollo at Cumae that Aeneas is bidden to go for further knowledge.⁶ Venus is only mentioned as receiving a sacrifice at the beginning of the journey,⁷ and then only among the other gods.⁸

¹ III. 380.

² III. 435-440.

³ III. 84-98.

⁴ III. 154-5.

⁵ III. 251.

⁶ III. 441-460.

⁷ III. 19.

⁸ Heinze (*Virgils epische Technik*, c. ii., pp. 94-96) would explain the absence of Juno and Venus as being imitated from the story of Odysseus from which Poseidon and Athene are absent in the same way. But the two

The Growth of the Aeneid

But in the other books we find indications that Venus was the guide of the Trojans. In I. 382 Aeneas says:

Matre dea monstrante viam.

Servius has an interesting note here: "Varro in secundo divinarum dicit: 'Ex quo de Troia est egressus Aeneas, Veneris eum per diem cotidie stellam vidisse, donec ad agrum Laurentem veniret, in quo eam non vidit ulterius: qua re terras cognovit esse fatales.' Unde Vergilius hoc loco, 'Matre dea monstrante viam.' " He quotes also II. 801:

Iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idae,

where the star of Venus does actually point the way. We should also suppose from I. 407-8—

*Quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis
Ludis imaginibus?*

that Venus had frequently appeared in disguise to

cases are not alike. Polyphemus prays to Poseidon for vengeance on Odysseus:

*Ὅψ' ἐκ κακῶς ἔλθοι, ὀλέσας ἀπο πάντας ἐταίρους,
Νηὸς ἔπ' ἀλλοτρίης, εὖροι δ' ἐν πῆματα οἴκῳ.*

And then follows the significant line—

ὧς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε κυανοχαίτης.

(Od. IX. 534-536). All the rest of Odysseus' story deals with the fulfilment of this prayer. Aeneas nowhere ascribes his troubles to Juno. Athene is indeed absent, but it may be remarked that there is no inconsistency between her absence in IX.-XII. and her presence in the other books; while in the Aeneid I. 382 is really inconsistent with III.; and that Venus does appear and play an important part in II., which is also part of Aeneas' narrative.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

help Aeneas; but there is no trace of any such appearance in III.: the only account of an earlier appearance is at the end of II.:

Cum mihi se, non ante oculis tam clara, videndam
Obtulit et pura per noctem in luce refulsit
Alma parens, confessa deam qualisque videri
Caelicolis et quanta solet.¹

6. The only event told in III. of the first landing in Sicily is the death of Anchises.² Yet it is quite clear from I. 195-197—

Vina bonus quae deinde cadis onerarat Acestes
Litore Trinacrio dederatque abeuntibus heros
Dividit,

that the Trojans had visited Acestes and received gifts from him. Moreover, it is clear from V.³ that they had been his guests at the time when Anchises died. This first visit is nowhere described, but its place is at the end of III. It is important, however, to notice that the lacuna is in the story, and *not in III. as it stands*. There is an artistic finish in the abrupt conclusion of III. which cannot be accidental.

7. The chronology of III. is not to be reconciled with that of I. and V. In I. there are two definite statements of time:

Multosque per annos
Errabant acti fatis maria omnia circum.⁴

and

Nam te iam septima portat
Omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus aestas.⁵

¹ II. 589-592.

² III. 707-711.

³ Cf. V. 35-41.

⁴ I. 31-2.

⁵ I. 755-6.

The Growth of the Aeneid

The seven years are again mentioned in V. 626:

Septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas.

The general feeling in I. and IV.–VI. is that the years of wandering have been many.

Conrads¹ in his *Quaestiones Virgilianae* was the first to put forward the theory that the events of III. cover only two or three years; this theory is supported by several facts:

(a) There is no mention of a seven years' journey in III.,² and a perfectly satisfactory chronology can be worked out in accordance with the few definite references to time, which brings the arrival in Carthage to the second summer after the fall of Troy.³

(b) Dionysius Halicarnasensis states that various accounts were given of the date of the founding of Lavinium, but that he prefers the view that it was founded δευτέρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον τὴν ἐκ Τροίας ἔτει.⁴ Diodorus Siculus in one of the fragments of the Seventh Book writes: Αἰνείας γὰρ μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν

¹ Conrads, ap. Ribbeck, *Prolegomena*, c. vi., pp. 77–8.

² If Vergil was thinking of a seven years' journey he made a great mistake in introducing Achaemenides. Odysseus visited the country of the Cyclopes early in his wanderings, and Achaemenides was rescued by the Trojans in the last summer of their voyage. Yet he had been in Sicily only three months (III. 645). The chronology of Odyssey IX.–XII. is very vague, so that the Trojans in the course of a two years' journey might easily have reached Sicily three months later than Odysseus, but in the seventh year Odysseus would have been four years with Calypso.

³ See p. 39, note.

⁴ Dion. H., I. 63.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

τῆς Τροίας ἐτῶν τριῶν παρελθόντων παρέλαβε τὴν
τῶν Λατίνων βασιλείαν.¹

(c) The style of III. suggests a short time rather than a long one. Certain incidents, such as the prophecy of Celaeno and the meeting with Andromache, are told in great detail, but the narrative dealing with the voyage and the attempts at colonization is hurried. Now Vergil uses this hurried narrative elsewhere, and always to suggest the crowding of events into a short time. A fine example may be found in II. 250–266, where the short disconnected sentences convey exactly the same effect as in III. 121–146, and elsewhere.

There are, then, in the Aeneid two distinct versions of the wanderings of Aeneas;² and these two versions

¹ Diod. Sic., VII. 5.

² The two versions may be shortly summarized as follows:

Version of III.

(1) The name of Italy is at first unknown, and is afterwards revealed. Latium is not mentioned.

(2) The geographical details are clear and the position of Italy is known.

(3) The prophecy of the eating of tables is given by Celaeno, and is an evil omen.

(4) The sign of the white sow and thirty pigs is referred to the founding of Lavinium. The Cumaean Sibyl will prophesy the wars in Italy.

Version of other Books.

The names of Italy and Latium are known from the beginning.

The geography is vague, and the position of Italy is unknown.

It is given by Anchises, and is a sign that the goal is reached.

It is referred to the founding of Alba Longa and the thirty years preceding its foundation. Anchises prophesies the wars in Italy.

The Growth of the Aeneid

cannot in any way be reconciled. It follows that, in revising, Vergil must have eliminated one of them.

It is at this point in the problem that the artistic value of III. must be taken into consideration. In spite of many touches of great beauty it is without doubt the weakest part of the Aeneid, and it is not easy to find a good reason for this weakness. It is not that the subject has less interest in itself, for the passages dealing with the wanderings of Aeneas in other books are full of interest; and we may notice how in VIII., a book in which the incidents are far less striking than in III., the narrative is varied by the story of Cacus and the splendid description of the Battle of Actium. It is certainly not that III. suffers from standing between two of the finest books of the poem, for V. loses nothing from its position between IV. and VI. Yet, though there are single lines and short passages of great beauty in III., the reader finds it difficult to maintain his interest. The whole book is sketchy and lacking in the vivid drawing by which Vergil makes his scenes live in the mind of the reader.¹

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| (5) The wrath of Juno is not mentioned. | The wrath of Juno is the cause of all troubles. |
| (6) Apollo is the guide. | Venus is the guide. |
| (7) No mention of Acestes occurs in the account of the first landing in Sicily. | Acetes entertains the Trojans on their first landing in Sicily. |
| (8) The journey takes two years. | The journey takes seven years. |

¹ There is no long passage in III. of outstanding beauty.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

It is also very significant that there is only one simile in III., and not a particularly striking one. The Cyclopes come down from the mountains and stand on the shore:

Quales cum vertice celso
Aeriae quercus aut coniferae cyparissi
Constiterunt, silva alta Iovis lucusve Dianae.¹

No other book has less than four similes, and X. has fifteen, and in the majority of cases the similes are elaborate. Again, the proportion of unfinished lines is large, 7 out of 718 lines: the book itself is a short one.²

All these considerations point to want of revision, and it is generally supposed that this book received less correction than any other. But want of revision will not account for the striking differences between III. and the other books.³ Nothing short

The meeting with Andromache (300-343) is perhaps the most beautiful; but if it be compared with any of the great passages, such as Aeneas' vision of Hector in II., or his meeting with Dido in VI., it will be seen to be lacking in the sustained power of these and other passages. Andromache's terrified questions—

Verane te facies, verus mihi nuntius adfers,
Nate dea ? vivisne ? aut, si lux alma recessit,
Hector ubi est ?

reach Vergil's highest level, but the rest of the scene falls below them. Moreover, III. is the only book which has no passage of sustained greatness; its beauty lies rather in scattered touches.

¹ III. 679-681.

² The average number of lines in a book is 824.

³ The end of II., with its large number of unfinished lines,

The Growth of the Aeneid

of rewriting the whole could bring it into harmony in style and matter with the rest of the poem.

On every ground, then, it may be assumed that III. is the earliest book of the Aeneid, and embodies Vergil's earliest conception of the wanderings of Aeneas. It is impossible to suppose with Heinze that it is later than I., II., and IV.-VIII., and written without reference to them;¹ a less careful poet than Vergil would hardly write two-thirds of an epic, leaving a gap at an early stage, only to fill it later with a narrative wholly inconsistent with the rest. It would be easier to follow Gercke in admitting it to be earlier than I., II., and IV.-VI., but later than VII.-XII.:² this is a plausible theory as far as the actual narrative is concerned, but it ignores a very important question: Why did Vergil, after writing six books, suddenly desert his usual style and produce a book very much inferior to the others? Gercke admittedly disregards aesthetic considerations,³ and therefore finds no difficulty. Yet it is not easy to suppose that the writer of VIII. and XII. would have produced nothing better than III.

If III. is the earliest book of the Aeneid all difficulties disappear. The earliest conception of the

and the difficulties raised by the striking out of 567-588, is an example of a passage comparatively unrevised. But no part of III. can approach it in vigour or pathos.

¹ *Vergils epische Technik*, c. ii., p. 92.

² *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, c. iii.

³ *Ibid.*, c. i. pp. 6-7.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

story naturally is inconsistent with the later one in many points; and the first attempt at narrative poetry is likely to produce inferior results. It may be objected that Vergil had already tried his hand at narrative poetry in the Fourth Georgic, but there is no reason to discredit the statement of Servius¹ that the latter half of the Fourth Georgic was written after the disgrace and death of Cornelius Gallus. Gallus died in 26 B.C., and the Aeneid was begun not later than 29 B.C. Thus the story of Orpheus is later than the earliest parts of the Aeneid. From 29 to 26 B.C. Vergil was learning to write narrative poetry, and to this period Aeneid III. certainly belongs. When he wrote Georgic IV. 315-558 he had nothing more to learn.

Here arises another question: Why did Vergil begin with the second part of Aeneas' story to Dido? This question may be best answered by the theory of Sabbadini² that the Third Aeneid was originally

¹ "Gallus . . . fuit autem amicus Vergilii adeo, ut quartus Georgicorum a medio usque ad finem eius laudes teneret: quas postea iubente Augusto in Aristaei fabulam commutavit" (Serv., in *Ecl.* X. 1). "Sane sciendum, ut supra diximus, ultimam partem huius libri esse mutatam: nam laudes Galli habuit locus ille, qui nunc Orpheus continet fabulam, quae inserta est, postquam irato Augusto Gallus occisus est" (Serv., in *Geor.* IV. 1).

² *Il primitivo disegno dell' Eneide*. This work is unfortunately out of print. Sabbadini regards the present form of III. as late. He assumes that it embodies Vergil's final conception and that the inconsistencies of other books point to the omission or alteration of passages included in the original draft of III. He bases his theory on the inconsistency between III. and the other books, dealing almost

The Growth of the Aeneid

written in the third person, and later was added to the narrative of Aeneas. If this theory is correct it explains many difficulties; the evidence supporting it is as follows:

1. The departure of Aeneas from Troy was generally taken as the starting-point of Roman history. It would therefore have struck Vergil as the natural point at which to begin. There are indications that he imitated Naevius,¹ whose account of the voyage from Asia was probably written in the third person. There is at least no trace of the first person in the very scanty fragments which are extant.

2. I. is a very awkward beginning; the plunge into the story at line 34 is very sudden, and the abruptness cannot be defended by referring it to the example of Homer. It is quite true that Homer does plunge *in medias res*, but both in the Iliad and the Odyssey it is at once made clear what the subject is and who are the principal actors.²

entirely with minute detail and not to any extent with general characteristics. He does not notice the statements of Suetonius and Servius with regard to the change of order.

¹ "Et totus hic locus de Naevio belli Punici libro translatus est" (Serv., *in Aen.* I. 198). "In principio Aeneidos tempestas describitur, et Venus apud Iovem queritur de periculis filii, et Iuppiter eam de futurorum prosperitate solatur. Hic locus totus sumptus a Naevio est ex primo libro belli Punici" (Macrob., Sat. VI. 2, 31).

² The subject and hero of the Iliad are given in the first line, and Agamemnon's part in the action is explained in line 7. In the Odyssey the name of Odysseus is not

The Present Form of the Aeneid

Vergil begins, as Homer does, by a brief summary of his subject, without, however, mentioning the name of his hero. Then he explains shortly Juno's reason for keeping the Trojans out of Italy. So far there is no difficulty; but at 34 we are suddenly confronted with the statement—

Vix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum
Vela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant.

It is easy to assume that the subject is the Trojans, but the mention of Sicily is totally unexpected, and there is no explanation. Then follows a detailed account of the raising of the storm by Juno. Finally, in 92 we come to Aeneas, who is here mentioned by name for the first time; nor is his first appearance very suitable to the dignity of an epic hero.¹ Again, the reference to Acestes and Sicily in 195-6 is very obscure.

It is clear that the connection between the exordium (1-33) and the opening of the narrative is very loose. Moreover, 34 is exactly the kind of line with which Vergil resumes the narrative after a pause. Such lines occur at the beginning of V., VIII., IX., X., XI., XII., and in all these cases there is a backward glance at the preceding events. If I. originally followed the account of the first visit to Sicily, its resumptive character would be explained; the book opened with 34, and 1-33 were prefixed

actually mentioned until line 21, but there is no digression between the exordium and the first appearance of his name.

¹ "Extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra."

The Growth of the Aeneid

to it after the change of order was made, as an introduction to the whole poem.

3. It would not be at all difficult to rewrite III. in the third person. There are many passages which need only the alteration of an occasional word. The whole episode of Achaemenides,¹ for example, could be rewritten in the third person without any difficulty; the first person is represented only by a few verbs,² nearly all of which might equally well have been originally in the third. In the paragraph immediately following³ the necessary change can be made in every verb, and indeed these lines are more natural in the third person. As they stand 697 contains a plural verb, "veneramur," which is closely followed by a singular, "exsupero"; yet both verbs apply to all the Trojans. The singular is continued throughout the

¹ 588-691.

² There is one pronoun, "nos" (666).

³ 692-706. This passage is quoted by Sabbadini in support of his theory. He also mentions the difficult lines 684-686—

Contra iussa monent Heleni, Scyllam atque Charybdim
Inter utramque viam leti discrimine parvo,
Ni teneant cursus,

where the sense seems to require "teneamus." If his theory is correct Vergil here omitted to make the necessary change of person. He also refers to 704, where, as Conington notes, "quondam" is out of place in the narrative of Aeneas. The other two lines, which he considers unsuitable in their present connection, 152 and 595, do not affect the argument; they are equally appropriate whether the narrator is Aeneas or Vergil.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

paragraph, though in all cases the plural would be more natural. If the original version was—

Iussi numina magna loci venerantur, et inde
Exsuperant praepingue solum stagnantis Helori,

the awkwardness of the lines in their present form is explained; “venerantur” could be replaced by a plural, “exsuperant” could not.

Again, such a passage as

Nec non et Teucri socia simul urbe fruuntur.
Illos porticibus rex accipiebat in amplis:
Aulai medio libabant pocula Bacchi
Impositis auro dapibus, paterasque tenebant,¹

is very unnatural in first person narrative. It may be urged that the whole narrative of Aeneas is in the main objective. Yet if II. and III. be compared, it will be found that, while in III. the change from the first person to the third person is a very simple one, the first person in II. is essential. There are many touches which could only occur in the narrative of an eyewitness. In two cases² Aeneas interrupts his story by speaking directly to Dido; Vergil no doubt wished the setting of the narrative to remain before the eyes of the reader, and secured his object by these interruptions;³ but in III. we lose

¹ 352–355. Cf. I. 707–8—

Nec non et Tyrii per limina laeta frequentes
Convenere, toris iussi discumbere pictis.

² II. 65–6, 506.

³ So in *Odyssey* XI. Odysseus breaks off his narrative, and only continues at the entreaty of Alcinous. Vergil could hardly have introduced such an interlude into the

The Growth of the Aeneid

sight of Dido altogether. Again, it may be noticed that Vergil uses the vivid "ecce" with some frequency to introduce a new or striking point in his narrative. As might be expected, this use is common in II., occurring eight times in all. It only occurs twice in III.¹ There are passages, also, where the thoughts and emotions of the speaker are strongly suggested. Such a subjective attitude may be observed in the account of Aeneas' dream of Hector:

Ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore qui redit exuvias indutus Achilli;²

or where the wooden horse enters the city:

O patria, O divum domus Ilium et incluta bello
Moenia Dardanidum! quater ipso in limine portae
Substitit atque utero sonitum quater arma dedere.³

There is no subjective touch in III.; nothing that suggests the personality of the speaker or draws attention to the hearers.⁴ Indeed, in the Third Book the personality of Aeneas may be said to be negligible; if there is a hero at all it is Anchises. Aeneas, of course, never dominates the action of the poem as Achilles does in the Iliad; but in the other books he

shorter narrative of Aeneas, but the lines addressed directly to Dido give the same appearance of reality.

¹ Excluding its use in 477, which is part of a speech.

² II. 274-5. The whole incident is strongly subjective in feeling. It is impossible to imagine it as third person narrative.

³ II. 241-243.

⁴ The passage dealing with the death of Anchises, 707-715, and the three concluding lines, 716-718, must be excepted. They can only have been added after the change of plan.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

is at least the central figure; and it is perhaps in the Second Book that he most nearly approaches the character of an epic hero.

4. In the Lives of Suetonius and Servius there are some curious statements, which suggest an early confusion with regard to the order of Aeneid I.–III. Suetonius writes: "Nisus grammaticus audisse se a senioribus aiebat Varium duorum librorum ordinem commutasse, et qui tunc secundus erat in tertium locum transtulisse."¹ Servius in his brief remarks on the Aeneid says: "Ordo quoque manifestus est; licet quidam superflue dicant, secundum primum esse, tertium secundum, et primum tertium."² Servius has probably misunderstood a tradition relating to an order differing from the present one.

Again, the statements of Suetonius and Servius about the books read to Augustus are contradictory. According to Suetonius³ they were the Second, Fourth, and Sixth; Servius gives them as the Third, Fourth, and Sixth. If the original order of the first three books was III., I., II., these two statements can be reconciled. Servius somehow had access to an older tradition.⁴

¹ Sueton., 42.

² Serv., in *Vit. Verg.*

³ "Cui [*i.e.*, Augusto] tamen tres omnino libros recitavit, secundum, quartum, sextum" (Sueton., 31). "Nam recitavit primum libros tertium et quartum" (Serv., in *Aen.* IV. 323). "Et constat hunc librum . . . Augusto et Octaviae esse recitatum" (Serv., in *Aen.* VI. 861).

⁴ It is incredible that Vergil should have read the present III.: he would hardly have chosen the weakest part of the poem.

The Growth of the Aeneid

It may, then, be concluded that III. is the earliest of the twelve books. It may be added that there are at least reasonable grounds for supposing that it was originally written in the third person and stood at the beginning of the Aeneid; but that on its removal it was only so far revised as was necessary for the change of form; it was never brought up to the level of the other books.¹

It will be necessary at a later point to deal more fully with the questions involved by the acceptance of this theory of a change of order. Here it only remains to answer the question: Why was III. left unrevised, and inconsistent with the rest of the poem?

The most probable explanation is that Vergil intended to reject III. altogether and write a new book, in which the wanderings of Aeneas would be told in accordance with the later conception. In this book he might have included parts of III. Some change would also be necessary at the beginning of I., but such a change would not involve more than the writing of a paragraph to connect the exordium with the rest of the book, and the removal or explanation of the references to Sicily.

¹ There are in III. only two passages which seem to point at all to any attempt at harmonizing it with the narrative of the other books. These are the account of the death of Anchises (707-715), which must always have stood in the present form, and 495-505, which appear to have two direct references to Creusa's prophecy (II. 780-784). These passages must have been added at the time of the change.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

We have one important statement about the intended revision. "Impositurus Aeneidi summam manum," says Suetonius, "statuit in Graeciam et in Asiam secedere, triennioque continuo nihil amplius quam emendare."¹ From what we know of Vergil's methods it is most likely that on this journey he intended to follow the course of Aeneas in order to give to his account of the shores of Asia and Greece the same truth and vividness which appear in his descriptions of Italy. It was, perhaps, because of his realization of the difference between the Third Book as it stands and his later conception of it that he was so anxious to destroy his manuscript.

It is, of course, impossible to say with certainty whether Varius and Tucca found the book actually marked for rejection. In view of Vergil's entreaty, "ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset," it is possible that they did find it so marked, but decided to include it rather than leave a gap in the story. Its inclusion would involve no real disloyalty to Vergil's memory, for its suppression would have greatly weakened the Aeneid as a whole.

NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF III.—According to the tradition Troy was taken in the summer.² Starting from its fall we get the following chronology:

¹ Sueton., 35.

² The time of year is variously given, but Dionysius (I. 63) and Plutarch (Camillus XIX.), agree in stating that Troy fell in summer. Dionysius gives the date as shortly after the summer solstice.

The Growth of the Aeneid

First year,	summer	-	Fall of Troy.
" "	winter	-	Building of fleet. ¹
Second year,	spring	-	Departure from Asia. Thrace, Delos, Crete.
" "	late summer	-	Departure from Crete. ² Strophades, Leucas.
" "	winter	-	Buthrotum. ³
Third year,	spring	-	Departure from Buthrotum; ⁴ voyage along Italian and Sicilian coasts; death of Anchises.
" "	summer	-	Arrival in Carthage.
" "	winter	-	Carthage. ⁵
Fourth year,	late winter	-	Departure from Carthage. ⁶

Conrads supposes that the Trojans sailed in the same summer in which Troy fell and spent the first winter in Thrace.

Following the above chronology, we shall find that Lavinium was founded three years after the fall of Troy; this agrees with the account of Diodorus Siculus.

¹ " Vix prima inceperat aestas " (III. 8).

² " Tum sterilis exurere Sirius agros " (III. 141).

³ " Interea magnum sol circumvolvitur annum
Et glacialis hiems Aquilonibus asperat undas."
(III. 284-5.)

⁴ " Iamque dies alterque dies processit, et aurae
Vela vocant tumidoque inflatur carbasus austro."
(III. 356-7.)

⁵ " Nunc hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fovere "
(IV. 193).

⁶ " Quin etiam hiberno, moliris sidere classem
Et mediis properas Aquilonibus ire per altum?"
(IV. 309-10.)

The Present Form of the Aeneid

2. I., II., AND VI.

In dealing with the present form of the separate books it is convenient to class I., II., and VI. together. All three books seem to have formed part of the original design, although I. and II. no longer occupy their original position. Nor does the plot of any of them appear to have been substantially altered; such additions or corrections as can be traced in them are only incidental.

The argument in favour of the theory that I. originally followed III., and that the exordium (12-33) was added after the change of order, has already been stated. As the connection between the exordium and what follows it is very loose, and as the traces of the original position still remain, we may reasonably assume that I. had reached its present position before the change was made, and that it received no subsequent revision.

There are three unfinished lines, all occurring in the latter half of the book. The first two (534 and 560) stand close together, 534 in the speech of Ilioneus,¹ and 560 at the end of the paragraph which contains the speech.² The third³ (636) is very interesting. It is generally said that the only unfinished line, which is incomplete in sense, is III. 340, but it is impossible to get a really satisfactory sense out of this one. Moreover, it is

¹ "Hic cursus fuit."

² "Talibus Ilioneus; cuncti simul ore fremebant
Dardanidae."

³ "Munera laetitiamque dii."

The Growth of the Aeneid

doubtful whether we should read "dei," "dii," or "die," all of which are recognized by Servius.¹

Here, as elsewhere in cases of obscurity of sense and reading, the difficulty arises from the fact that the editors did not understand what Vergil meant. In this particular case the passage in which the line occurs (633-642) may well have been a note for a longer passage descriptive of the preparations for the entertainment of the Trojans. It is unlike Vergil to cut short a description of this kind; the abruptness of the passage in conjunction with the presence of an obscure unfinished line is a sure sign of incompleteness.

Several small inconsistencies have been noted by various critics, but they are of no importance with regard to the main problem. The only one which is at all important is to be found in 755-6. The difficulty of the chronology involved in the words "septima aestas" is closely connected with the problem raised by V. and will be discussed later.²

¹ Servius explains "dei" as meaning "Liberi patris, ac per hoc vinum." Conington adopts "dei" and compares IX. 337—

Multoque iacebat
Membra deo victus.

But there the whole passage deals with men who had fallen asleep after heavy drinking, whereas here there is nothing to connect "dei" with Bacchus. "Dii" is supported by Aulus Gellius, IX. 14. 8, and is now generally adopted. But the sense is not very satisfactory. Servius adds a note: "Sane quidam hunc versum intelligi non putant posse, ut est ille 'quem tibi iam Troia'." This is probably the correct view.

² See pp. 63 ff.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

But if the theory of the change of position of III. be accepted there is a further difficulty in the words "erroresque tuos," for on this theory Aeneas did not give any account of his wanderings. Sabbadini supposes that these two lines are a late addition. But they may equally have belonged to the original version. It is not necessary to assume an oversight on Vergil's part, for it would not be unnatural for Aeneas to ignore the second part of the request. In fact, the exordium of II. suggests that Aeneas did not intend to tell more than the story of Troy. "It is growing late," he says,

Sed si tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros
Et breviter Troiae supremum audire laborem,
Quamquam animus meminisse horret, luctuque refugit
Incipiam.

This seems quite consistent with Dido's request, even if III. did not originally stand in its present place. She naturally asks for the whole story, but, as part of it has already been told, Vergil makes Aeneas allege the lateness of the hour as an excuse for telling only the first part of his adventures.

An account of the sack of Troy was undoubtedly part of the original scheme, for a description of the escape of Aeneas was a necessary link between the Aeneid and the Trojan Cycle. The general outline of II. has probably been very little modified. There is considerable evidence for supposing that the two passages dealing with Laocoon¹ were inserted after

¹ II. 40-56, 199-233.

The Growth of the Aeneid

the story of Sinon was completed.¹ Indeed, the earlier part of the book seems to have received careful revision. As far as 566 there are very few difficulties or marks of incompleteness; the Laocoon scenes have not been completely fitted into their place;² and the paragraph 453-468 which ends with a half-line seems to require expansion.³ The two remaining half-lines 66 and 346⁴ both occur in the middle of a paragraph and are extremely effective. In such cases we must suppose that Vergil left them unfinished until a satisfactory ending should suggest itself.

From 567 to the end the case is very different. In this part of the book there are six unfinished lines, an unusually large proportion. Moreover, it is here that the much-disputed lines about Helen occur.⁵

On the authenticity of these lines the opinions of critics are divided. They are not found in any of the principal MSS., and are nowhere quoted by grammarians. Such evidence would in an ordinary case be conclusive proof of interpolation. Servius, however, has given us definite information, which there is no reason to disbelieve. After stating that the Aeneid was edited by Varius and Tucca he

¹ E. Bethe, *Vergilstudien*, i.; *Rhein Mus.*, xlv., pp. 511 ff.

² The second ends with a half-line (233).

³ The description is rather brief and disconnected, but this may be intentional.

⁴ "Accipe nunc Danaum insidias et crimine ab uno
Disce omnis." (II. 65-6.)

"Infelix qui non sponsae praecepta furentis
Audierit." (II. 345-6.)

⁵ II. 567-588.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

says: "In secundo hos versus constat esse detractos," and quotes the passage. Again, on II. 566 we find this note: "Ignibus aegra dedere; post hunc versum hi versus fuerunt qui a Tucca et Vario obliti sunt"; and on 592: "Ut enim in primo diximus, aliquos hinc versus constat esse sublato, nec immerito. Nam et turpe est viro forti contra feminam irasci, et contrarium est Helenam in domo Priami fuisse illi rei, quae in sexto dicitur, quia in domo est inventa Deiphobi, postquam ex summa arce vocaverat Graecos. Hinc autem versus esse sublato, Veneris verba declarant dicentis 'non tibi Tyndaridis facies invisa Lacaenae'."

Servius, then, had no doubt that the lines were genuine. In fact, if we assume them to be spurious two difficult questions arise: How was an interpolator able to write lines which are so strikingly Vergilian in style and vigour of description?¹ and, Why is there no other striking case of interpolation to be detected in the Aeneid?

The account of Servius has been suspected on the ground that Varius and Tucca would not have been likely to remove any passage from the text. This is the view of Ribbeck² and of Nettleship,³ and is

¹ The opening lines are extraordinarily vivid. The picture of the guilty Helen lurking in the shadows of the shrine and of the cautious approach of Aeneas is very characteristic. The brevity and clearness of the description are strikingly Vergilian.

² "Item audacissime, immo temere et ferociter Varius et Tucca rem egissent, si verum est quod Servius affirmat" (Ribbeck, *Prolegomena*, c. vii., p. 92).

³ "It is hardly conceivable that Varius and Tucca . . .

The Growth of the Aeneid

reasonable enough, if we are to suppose that Servius was referring to the arbitrary removal of a passage to which the editors personally objected. But Servius does not suggest anything of the kind; what he says is that Augustus laid on them the condition "ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen." Vergil's last instructions, "ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset,"¹ make their action quite clear. The lines were removed because they were "superflua"—*i.e.*, because Vergil himself had struck them out.

Servius gives two reasons for their rejection. The first, that it is unworthy of a brave man to wish to kill a woman, may be disregarded. The second, that they do not agree with VI. 511-534, is probably the true one. How the lines came to survive it is impossible to say; but the Aeneid was already known, at least in part,² before the death of Vergil, so that an old copy of II. may have existed; or the editors may have kept some record, to which Servius or his authorities had access.

The position of II. is therefore a very interesting one. Two-thirds of it have been considerably, though not completely, revised. The final third has received very little revision, and in one case the revision has taken the form of striking out a passage in such a way that the sense of the context is de-

should have been guilty of such a vandalism as to remove twenty lines of Vergil from the text of the Aeneid" (Note on the passage by Nettleship in Conington's *Vergil*).

¹ Sueton., 40.

² Cf. Sueton., 30-33.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

stroyed. In the light of these facts it is at least a reasonable conjecture that Vergil was engaged on the revision of II. at the time of his death, and that the removal of 567-588 was his latest correction. In any case, it is clear that the editors were here dealing with a copy which had been to some extent corrected.

The Sixth Book is perhaps the most elaborate part of the whole poem; it reaches and maintains a level of magnificence not equalled even by the Second Book. This elaboration must cover a long period, and was probably not complete when the book was read to Augustus in 23 or 22 B.C. Indeed, the story told by Suetonius¹ and Servius² of Vergil's completing the half-line "Aere ciere viros" while reading this book aloud suggests that it was still in process of revision at the time. We may, however, conclude that the main part of it was composed later than I.-IV., though it is almost certainly earlier than the present form of V.³ It seems likely that it is later than the end of the Fourth Georgic, and it must have been fairly complete at the end of the year 23 B.C., when the Marcellus lines were

¹ "Nam cum hactenus haberet 'Miscenum Aeoliden' adiecisse 'quo non praestantior alter' item huic 'aere ciere viros' simili calore iactatum subiunxisse 'Martemque accendere cantu'" (Sueton., 34).

² "Martemque accendere cantu; hemistichium hoc dicitur addidisse dum recitat" (Serv., in *Aen.* VI. 165). Ribbeck (*Prolegomena*, pp. 63-4) shows that the account of Suetonius is impossible; the version of Servius is the correct one.

³ See p. 66.

The Growth of the Aeneid

added. Thus its composition would fall within the period 26-23 B.C.

It seems on the whole most likely that VI. formed part of the original plan. Gercke does indeed put forward a plausible theory that only the opening belongs to Vergil's first conception, and that the revelation of the destiny of Rome was given to Aeneas in a dream in Latium.¹ Against this theory stands the fact that VI. forms the climax of the first half of the Aeneid, and is essential to the whole structure of the epic.² Moreover, the subject was one which had the greatest interest for Vergil, whose love of philosophy had little scope in the rest of the Aeneid. He must have been influenced, too, by the Nekyia of the Odyssey; Aeneas must receive a revelation as Odysseus did, and Vergil, as he so often does, lays his foundation by taking an idea from the Homeric story.³

There was, it is true, a tradition preserved by

¹ *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, pp. 176 ff.

² For the importance of VI. and its position in relation to the whole Aeneid see Professor R. S. Conway's Essay, "The Structure of the Sixth Book of the Aeneid," in *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1913).

³ The objection that Helenus only tells Aeneas to visit the Sibyl and to learn his fate from her, and that therefore the Nekyia was not conceived when the Third Book was written, has no real force. Helenus does not predict the death of Anchises, and so can hardly predict a revelation by his ghost. In the final revision of III. the prophecy of Helenus would probably have been considerably modified and the nature of the revelation at Cumae would have been left entirely vague.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

Fabius Pictor, and quoted by Cicero,¹ that the fate of Aeneas was predicted to him in a dream, but it is quite unnecessary to suppose that Vergil ever used, or intended to use, this form of the legend, although VI. may have been partly suggested by it. The framework of the Sixth Book—the oracle of Apollo and the guidance of the Cumaean Sibyl—certainly belongs to Vergil's oldest conception, and in all probability the Palinurus episode with the reference to Apollo, "*Fallax haud ante repertus*,"² represents the version of the story given in III. rather than in the later books.

There are only two unfinished lines, 94 and 835. In both cases there is some ground for supposing that a passage of several lines has been removed. In the first case the Sibyl's prophecy of a second Trojan war ends with the lines:

*Causa mali tanti coniunx iterum hospita Teucris
Externique iterum thalami.*³

The next words—"Tu ne cede malis"—follow very abruptly, and together with the unfinished line suggest strongly that the passage is not complete. Moreover, the words of Helenus in III.—⁴

*Illa tibi Italiae populos venturaque bella
Et quo quemque modo fugiasque ferasque laborem
Expediet,*⁴

¹ "Aeneae somnium, quod in nostri Fabii Pictoris Graecis annalibus eiusmodi est, ut omnia, quae ab Aenea gesta sunt quaeque illi acciderunt, ea fuerint, quae ei secundum quietem visa sunt" (Cic., Div. I. 43).

² VI. 343. ³ VI. 93-4. ⁴ III. 458-460. See p. 22.

The Growth of the Aeneid

would have led us to expect here some account of the Italians and the coming war. The Sibyl, however, only gives a vague prophecy of war in Italy, and we are told later, in a passage which very closely coincides in wording with the lines just quoted, that Anchises predicted to Aeneas the war in Italy.¹ Thus it seems extremely probable that the Sibyl did originally speak more definitely, but that the lines were removed, and 888-892 were substituted at another point in the narrative. The advantages of such a change would be considerable; a prophecy of any length at this point would destroy the proportion of the book and would delay the descent into Hades: moreover, the details would only anticipate scenes in the later books, which, as it is, are developed without repetition. At the same time the Sibyl's prophecy does not sink into insignificance, for by means of the references to Lavinia and Turnus it forms a link between the two parts of the poem, and draws the parallel between the Trojan and Latin wars, so often insisted on in the later books.

The other half-line—

Proice tela manu, sanguis meus !²

¹ Quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
Incenditque animum famae venientis amore,
Exim bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda
Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,
Et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem.

If these lines are omitted there is no break in sense.
They may easily be a late insertion.

² VI. 835.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

is very effective as it stands. It may be that Vergil merely found a difficulty in finishing it, and left it until a suitable ending should occur to him. Professor Conway, however, remarks that the praise of Pompey and Julius Caesar is rather doubtful, and Vergil certainly dwells here on the miseries of civil war rather than the glory of the victor. Thus the unfinished line may in this case point to the removal of a passage which would be unsuitable in an account of Roman triumphs; and this is all the more likely in a book which was actually read to Augustus.

Ribbeck was probably right in marking a lacuna after 601. Here a line containing a reference to Tantalus seems to be required. This line, if it was ever written, may either have been struck out by Vergil and not replaced, or have been lost at an early date.

The difficulties arising out of the story of Palinurus belong to V. rather than VI., as does the question of the position of VI. 1-2.

NOTE ON INCONSISTENCIES IN VI.—In his introduction to the Sixth Book Conington complains that in it “we meet with much that appears to us not only unaccountably or presumably wrong, but demonstrably inconsistent or confused.” Most of the passages to which he refers have been shown by modern criticism to be perfectly consistent with the plan of the book, although they are frequently obscure in detail, while the actual inconsistencies are of little importance except in the cases where

The Growth of the Aeneid

they throw light on the composition of other books. But whether Conington's view be accepted or not, the problems raised in relation to Vergil's conception of life after death throw no light on the composition of the Aeneid as a whole. The difficulties of the Sixth Book are due to a certain vagueness in the treatment of the setting—a vagueness which is largely intentional, and which conveys a sense of mystery which is unsurpassed in literature. We may suppose that, apart from clearing up real obscurities, Vergil would have been very cautious in revising, especially where the slightest error in description might have destroyed the atmosphere.

3. THE SOURCES OF IV.

The most important problem raised by Aeneid IV. is the question of its sources in history and legend. Its literary sources are not difficult to trace; Servius¹ mentions the parallel between Dido and the Medea of Apollonius Rhodius, and the influence of the Attic drama is marked throughout the book. A modern critic² also has pointed out that Vergil, in drawing the picture of the forsaken Dido, was recalling the deserted Ariadne of Catullus. Following his usual custom Vergil has drawn freely upon the work of older poets, and has produced a piece of

¹ "Apollonius Argonautica scripsit et in tertio inducit amantem Medeam: inde totus hic liber translatus est" (Serv., in *Aen.* IV. 1). Cf. Macrobius, Sat. V. 17. 4.

² Ettore Stampini, *Studi di letteratura e filologia latina* (Torino, 1917): "La legenda di Enea e Didone."

The Present Form of the Aeneid

work which clearly shows their influence, and yet is entirely original in conception and treatment. The question of the legendary and historical sources is a much more difficult one; and with the scanty evidence which we possess it is impossible to decide with certainty whether the connection between Aeneas and Carthage existed before Vergil or not.

The story of Dido must have formed a part of the earliest plan of the Aeneid. Even if we exclude the two books which contain the narrative of Aeneas, the action of the greater part of I. and of the whole of IV. takes place in Carthage, so that the theory that the Carthaginian episode was an afterthought¹ is opposed to the statement of Suetonius that the Aeneid was from the first sketched out in twelve books. In all the details of the foundation of Carthage Vergil seems to have closely followed the traditional account, which is given in some detail by Pompeius Trogus² (Justin, xviii. 4-6). But in the accepted tradition there is not only no mention of Aeneas, but no possible place for Aeneas. It was an indubitable fact that Dido killed herself in order to avoid marriage with an African king. Moreover, according to the usually accepted chronology Aeneas came to Carthage 340 years before

¹ H. Dessau ("Vergil und Karthago," *Hermes*, vol. xlix., Berlin, 1914) holds this view.

² Nettleship in "The Story of Aeneas' Wanderings" in Conington's *Vergil*, vol. ii., fourth edition, has made a close comparison of the two accounts and shows that in all probability Vergil and Pompeius Trogus were drawing from the same source.

The Growth of the Aeneid

the foundation of Rome,¹ whereas Carthage was founded only forty years before Rome. This is perhaps a small matter, for legendary chronology is apt to be hopelessly confused; but the violent change in the accepted form of the legend was a piece of audacity which might have been severely censured if its brilliant success had not, as far as the general public was concerned, completely ousted the original form of the story.²

It has often been stated that it was not Vergil but Naevius who first brought Aeneas and Dido together. This theory rests on very slender authority. The statements of Servius and Macrobius, that the storm, and Aeneas' encouraging speech, and the conversation of Venus and Juppiter in I., were taken from Naevius, do not prove that the whole of I. and consequently of IV. were also taken from Naevius.³ Two fragments of Naevius,

¹ Serv., in *Aen.* IV. 459. Timaeus says that Rome and Carthage were founded on the same day.

² "Quod ita elegantius auctore digessit, ut fabula lascivientis Didonis, quam falsam novit universitas, per tot tamen saecula speciem veritatis obtineat. . . . Tantum valuit pulchritudo narrandi, ut omnes Phoenissae castitatis conscii, nec ignari manum sibi iniecissem reginam, ne pateretur damnum pudoris, coniveant tamen fabulae" (Macrobius, Sat. V. 17. 5-6).

³ Noack ("Die Erste Aeneis Vergils," *Hermes*, xxvi., 1892) believes that the first version of the Aeneid was taken straight from Naevius and consisted of I., II., IV., and VI., and that III. and V. were added later. For the statements of Servius and Macrobius see p. 32. They must not in any case be taken too literally. Servius declares that the whole of Aeneid IV. was taken over from Apol-

The Present Form of the Aeneid

indeed, have been frequently quoted in support; Servius has a note on IV. 9, "*Cuius filiae fuerint Anna et Dido Naevius dicit.*" But Naevius must have related the foundation of Carthage, and could hardly have avoided mentioning Dido. It has also been said that there is an allusion to Dido in the lines—

*Blande et docte percontat Aenea quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquerit ?¹*

but it is equally likely that the subject is Latinus, who asks for information in the Aeneid also.² The adverb "*blande*" may seem to suggest that the speaker is a woman, but it need mean no more than "*courteously.*" It is not likely that any book of the *Bellum Punicum* corresponded to Aeneid II., for the few fragments that are left of the departure from Troy apparently belong to the poet's narrative.

There is no mention of Aeneas in the fragments of Timaeus or in Justin's Epitome of Pompeius Trogus. Both these historians give the same account, only differing in unimportant details. Similarly, no historian who has dealt with the legend of Aeneas makes any mention of Dido or Carthage in connection with it. If Naevius had brought Aeneas to Carthage, we should have expected to find some reference to his account in the

Ionius Rhodius. If the *Argonautica* had not survived, Vergil's debt to its author would probably have been greatly overestimated.

¹ Fr. 24 (Baehrens).

² VII. 195-211.

The Growth of the Aeneid

work of the later historians. Where the evidence is so scanty, it is impossible to give any adequate proof; but it is on the whole more likely that there was no connection between Aeneas and Dido in the *Bellum Punicum*.

Whether Naevius did or did not bring Aeneas to Carthage, the love-story of Dido and Aeneas seems to have been invented by Vergil. In fact, there is positive evidence of it in the sentences from Macrobius already quoted, and in an anonymous poem from the Greek Anthology, an inscription for a statue of Dido, who complains that her reputation has suffered unjustly,

Οὐδὲ γὰρ Αἰνείαν ποτ' ἐσέδρακον, οὐδὲ χρόνοισι
Τροίης περθομένης ἦλυθον ἐς Λιβύην.

Πιερίδες, τί μοι ἀγνὸν ἐφωπλίσσασθε Μάρωνα
οἷα καθ' ἡμετέρης ψεύσατο παρθενίης;¹

This poem was translated by Ausonius with four additional lines:

Vos magis historicis, lectores, credite de me
Quam qui furta deum concubitusque canunt
Falsidici vates, temerant qui carmine verum
Humanisque deos assimilant vitiis.²

There remains, however, a further question: Was

¹ XVI. 151.

² Epig. 118. Ausonius translates the first couplet which I have quoted—

Namque nec Aeneas vidit me Troius umquam
Nec Libyam advenit classibus Iliacis,

so that ἦλυθον may be corrupt. Ἦλυθεν has been suggested, and makes better sense.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

there any connection between Aeneas and Carthage in pre-Vergilian legend? There are three passages which point to the possibility of such a connection.

1. Thucydides, VI. 2. 3: Ἰλίου δὲ ἀλίσκομένου τῶν Τρώων τινὲς διαφυγόντες Ἀχαιοὺς πλοίοις ἀφικνοῦνται πρὸς τὴν Σικελίαν, καὶ ὄμοροι τοῖς Σικανοῖς οἰκήσαντες ξύμπαντες μὲν Ἑλυμοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, πόλεις δ' αὐτῶν Ἐρυξ τε καὶ Ἐγεστα. προσξυνώκησαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ Φωκέων¹ τινὲς τῶν ἀπὸ Τροίας τότε χειμῶνι ἐς Διβύην πρῶτον, ἔπειτα ἐς Σικελίαν ἀπ' αὐτῆς κατενεχθέντες.

2. Servius, in *Aen.* IV. 682: "Varro ait non Didonem, sed Annam amore Aeneae impulsam se supra rogam interemisse."²

3. Ovid, *Fasti* III. 543-656.³ Here Anna, Dido's sister, is identified with Anna Perenna, and the story of her flight from Carthage and meeting with Aeneas in Italy is told.

The passage in Thucydides suggests that there was some traditional connection between the Sicilian Trojans and Africa, and it is noticeable that Segesta was afterwards associated with Aeneas. If Servius quotes Varro correctly, his statement is extremely important, as it proves the existence of a pre-Vergilian legend. But Servius occasionally mis-

¹ Φωκέων is almost certainly corrupt. Professor Ridgeway suggests Φρυγῶν.

² Cf. Serv., in *Aen.* V. 4: "Sane sciendum Varronem dicere Aenean ab Anna amatum."

³ Silius Italicus (VIII. 44-201) gives at greater length the same story as Ovid, but, as his source is obviously the passage in the *Fasti*, his account may be disregarded.

The Growth of the Aeneid

quotes, and, as Dessau¹ points out, Varro may simply have used Anna as another name for Dido, and the name of Aeneas may have been introduced by the Vergilian commentators. Ovid's account, again, must be taken with caution, as we have no means of knowing how far he is following Vergil; but on the whole it would seem probable that he did not invent the story which connected Anna Perenna with Aeneas and Anna of Carthage. His opening lines—

Quae tamen haec Dea sit, quoniam rumoribus errant
Fabula proposito nulla tacenda meo,²

followed as they are by several legends of the goddess, suggest that he was recording the various traditions, though he has been careful to reconcile the existing Carthaginian legend with the version given in Aeneid IV.³

On the whole, then, the evidence suggests that there was some very shadowy legend which connected Aeneas with Carthage, and which suggested to Vergil the introduction of Carthage into the Aeneid. This legend probably had its source in the tradition recorded by Thucydides. Segesta was founded by Trojan settlers in Sicily, together with

¹ "Vergil und Karthago."

² Fasti III. 543-4.

³ It is possible that Vergil himself was thinking of some connection between Anna and Aeneas when he wrote IV. 421-423. Gercke (*Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, p. 49, n.) seems to think that these lines imply a love-affair between them, but there is no other evidence in the Aeneid to support such a view.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

fugitives from Troy, who had visited Africa; it was also founded by the Trojan Aeneas; therefore Aeneas visited Africa. If the identification of Anna of Carthage with Anna Perenna is earlier than Vergil, it would have helped to establish the tradition. Anna of Carthage appears in Roman literature at least as early as the *Bellum Punicum*, and her identification with the Roman goddess is very natural. It is noticeable that in Ovid's story Anna ends her life in the River Numicius. In this river Aeneas also disappeared, and he was worshipped on its banks as Juppiter Indiges. This fact, together with the confusion between Anna Perenna and Anna of Carthage, may have been the first link between Aeneas and Carthage, as the legend recorded by Thucydides was the first link between Aeneas and Africa.

The Fourth Book is probably early: it must, of course, be later than III., and probably than I. It carries on the story from the point where I. ends without any inconsistency,¹ a fact which suggests

¹ The opening lines of IV—

At regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura

Vulnus alit venis et cacco carpitur igni—

are not altogether clear. "Iamdudum" is awkward, seeing that one night has elapsed. The difficulty is, however, not an important one. If Vergil passed on from I. to IV., omitting Aeneas' narrative, he may have had in his mind the length of the story which would eventually stand between them, and not the time which had actually passed. But "iamdudum" may be simply due to careless writing.

The Growth of the Aeneid

that the two books were written in the order in which they stand, and that II. was set aside for the time. II. must, of course, have been destined from the first to stand between I. and IV., but the writing of it might easily have been postponed until the main story was complete. In view of the general style of IV., it seems likely that it is the earlier. In spite of its extraordinary beauty and pathos there is a certain looseness of construction in IV. which reminds us rather of III. and I. than of VI. The part played by the gods in the action is not very skilfully worked out, and the African king, Iarbas, appears to be introduced only for the sake of drawing Juppiter's attention to Dido and Aeneas. It was decidedly a mistake to make the fate of Rome turn on the jealousy of a barbarous chief. The account of Dido's magic rites is obscure and confused. Their purpose apparently is to deceive Anna, and perhaps at the same time that Dido may dedicate herself to the lower gods, as the Alcestis of Euripides does. Yet 515-6 refer to a love-charm, and apparently to a definite attempt to recover the love of Aeneas. The treatment of the gods especially recalls I., which is somewhat overweighted with divine machinery. II., V., and VI., on the other hand, are very careful in construction and the gods are kept in the background. On the whole, then, there is good evidence for supposing that IV. is earlier than II., but it is also possible that the superior construction of II. is due to revision.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

There are five unfinished lines in IV. The first¹ occurs in the middle of a speech near the beginning; the other four are fairly close together in the middle of the book. Two² fall at the end of a paragraph; the first of these is at the end of a speech; the second appears to be a note for a descriptive passage. Another³ occurs in the description of the Trojan preparations for sailing, a passage which Vergil would have been very likely to expand. The last⁴ occurs in the account of Dido's magic rites; the difficulty of this passage has already been noticed, and, indeed, it is probable that Vergil would have removed 515-6 altogether. If Dido is performing funeral rites, there is no point in a love-charm; and there is no suggestion anywhere that she is really trying to win Aeneas back; in fact, she has already determined to kill herself.⁵

It may, then, be assumed that IV. was written early and little revised. The fact that in spite of some technical faults it is one of the greatest books of the Aeneid is due to the subject and its powerful hold on Vergil's imagination. But from the point of view of the national epic the position of IV. is

¹ "Quid bella Tyro surgentia dicam
Germanique minas?" (43-4).

² "Italiam non sponte sequor" (361).
"Ergo iussa parat" (503).

³ "Frondentisque ferunt remos et robora silvis
Infabricata fugae studio" (399-400).

⁴ "Quaeritur et nascentis equi de fronte revulsus
Et matri praereptus amor" (515-6).

⁵ Cf. 475.

The Growth of the Aeneid

very curious. Vergil no doubt originally meant the reader to see Dido in the light of a temptress, and Aeneas, the instrument of the gods, pitying and yet resisting her; but he has hardly succeeded in conveying that impression. We cannot regard Dido as a temptress because Aeneas apparently feels no desire to remain with her. Again, to a modern reader no plea of a divine command can really justify Aeneas; our sympathies throughout the book are on the wrong side exactly as they are in *Paradise Lost*. Nor can Dido be regarded as suffering under a mysterious and inevitable destiny like Oedipus or Orestes; Vergil has tried to make her a pawn in the game played by Juno and Venus, but the fact remains that the reader looks upon her as a wronged woman, and on Aeneas as the sole cause of her suffering. The ancient reader would no doubt have felt this less strongly, for the ancients, though they pitied the forsaken heroines, did not as a rule condemn their lovers. But even in Vergil's own day it must have been felt that the Fourth Book, considered as a part of the national epic, was a mistake. The destiny of Aeneas has ceased to be the centre of interest; it is entirely obscured by the tragedy of Dido. Vergil might perhaps have given Aeneas a more prominent part, by insisting more strongly on the divine call and on his unwillingness to obey it. But any change in the treatment of Aeneas would have lessened the pathos of Dido's story, and, had Vergil lived to revise the poem, he must have realized the power

The Present Form of the Aeneid

and beauty of the Fourth Book and left it untouched.¹

4. THE RELATION OF V. TO THE OTHER BOOKS

The Fifth Book of the Aeneid, like the Third, stands alone, and must be considered apart from the others. Its inconsistencies are not as striking as those of III., but they can hardly be accidental. In fact, a close examination of the problems of V. shows that, in its present form at least, it was not part of the original conception.

There are three important points in which V. is inconsistent with the other books.

I. The chronology cannot be reconciled with that of I., IV., and VI. At the end of I. Dido says to Aeneas:

Nam te iam septima portat
Omnibus errantem terris et fluctibus aestas.²

In V. the false Beroe says:

Septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas.³

It is quite clear from the conclusion of III. that Anchises died immediately before the voyage in which Aeneas was carried to Carthage. Thus the death of Anchises fell in the seventh summer after the fall of Troy; yet the first anniversary of his

¹ Cf. Mr. H. W. Garrod's Introduction to the *Oxford Book of Latin Verse*, pp. xviii ff.

² I. 755-6.

³ V. 626.

The Growth of the Aeneid

death, which is celebrated in V., also fell in the seventh summer.

If this were the only difficulty, it would be easy to explain it by supposing that Vergil had made a mistake at the end of I. But the seasons are also in hopeless confusion. The Trojans seem to have arrived at Carthage in the summer, and certainly spent the first part of the winter in Carthage. It is clear from Dido's words in IV. 309-10 that it was still winter when Aeneas set out for Italy, and in VI. Palinurus mentions winter in connection with the same voyage.¹ In V., however, it is certainly summer.² Thus it is quite impossible to fit V. into the chronology of the rest of the poem.

2. The account of the death of Palinurus in V. is inconsistent with that of VI. Apart from the difficulty of the season the two stories are entirely different. In V. he is thrown from the ship in calm weather by the god of sleep;³ this happens on the voyage from Sicily, and fulfils the promise of Neptune that all the Trojans except one shall reach the harbour of Avernus.⁴ In VI. he falls from the ship in a storm on a voyage from Libya.⁵ Further, in the account of VI. we hear of an oracle of Apollo that Palinurus was to reach Italy,⁶ and this oracle is not mentioned elsewhere. A more serious difficulty is to be found in his statement that he had

¹ "Tris Notus hibernas immensa per aequora noctes
Vexit me violentus aqua" (VI. 355-6).

² V. 626.

³ V. 833-860.

⁴ V. 813-815.

⁵ VI. 337-362.

⁶ VI. 344-346.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

been three days in the water;¹ yet the voyage from Sicily apparently does not occupy more than one night, and Aeneas descends to Hades on the very day of his arrival at Cumæ.

3. In IV. Aeneas says to Dido:

Me patris Anchisæ, quotiens umentibus umbris
Nox operit terras, quotiens astra ignea surgunt,
Admonet in somnis et turbida terret imago;²

and again in VI. to Anchises:

Tua me, genitor, tua tristis imago
Saepius occurrens hæc limina tendere adegit.³

According to these two passages Anchises had appeared to Aeneas several times, even before he left Carthage. But the only account of such a vision is in V. 722-742, where the language suggests that this was the first time that Aeneas had dreamed of his father.

To these three points may be added two others, which suggest strongly that V. did not originally stand between IV. and VI.

I. The narrative runs on from IV. to VI. quite naturally and V. is in the main a digression. The second visit to Sicily involves a certain amount of awkwardness, especially as the first visit has never

¹ VI. 355-6.

² IV. 351-353.

³ VI. 695-6. Cf. also 115-6, on which Conington remarks in his introduction to V. that this request "would seem rather to have been an injunction given in life than identical with that which we read of vv. 731 fol. of this book." The imperfect "dabat" may, however, only refer to the repeated visions which Aeneas mentions to Dido.

The Growth of the Aeneid

been described. The chronological difficulties are removed if we suppose that VI. originally followed IV., for in that case the three days and the voyage from Libya, which Palinurus mentions, cause no difficulty. The Trojans leave Carthage while it is still winter and land at Cumae after a voyage of a few days.

2. Servius notes¹ that the first two lines of VI. were removed by Varius and Tucca from their original place at the end of V. It is not probable that this was done without some indication in Vergil's manuscript. Perhaps a few lines were also removed from the beginning of VI.; if V. was a late addition, some modification of VI. must have been necessary; it is not likely that it opened with "Obvertunt pelago proras." Vergil never begins a new book without some reference to previous events.²

The theory that VI. originally followed IV. was first stated by Conrads, and has been accepted by most critics. It is also generally agreed that V. in its present form is in all probability later than VI. Conrads, however, seems to have been right in observing that some part of the contents of V. must have formed part of the original story. If V. as it

¹ "Sciendum sane, Tuccam et Varium hunc finem quinti esse voluisse. Nam a Vergilio duo versus sequentes huic iuncti fuerunt: unde in nonnullis antiquis codicibus sexti initium est: Obvertunt pelago proras" (Serv., in *Aen.* V. 871).

² The connection is generally a clause or adverb of time. In II., VI., and VII., the narrative runs straight on, but with a backward glance at the lines immediately preceding.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

stands was an afterthought, the essential parts of it must have been given earlier in the Aeneid. Conrads supposed that they originally formed the end of III. Gustav Kettner,¹ following Conrads, supposed that V. in its original form was an additional book in the narrative of Aeneas.

If, however, III. did not originally form part of Aeneas' narrative, Kettner's theory breaks down, at least so far as the actual form of V. is concerned. The substance of V. could not originally have formed a part of the narrative, unless III. were also originally a part of it. He was, however, probably right in supposing that III., whatever its original position, was followed by a book containing some at least of the material which was later worked up into V., and also the incidents which are missing at the end of III. as it now stands.

If III. was originally the first book, it must have ended at 706. Whether the book that Vergil originally intended to follow was ever written it is impossible to say certainly, but it may have been at any rate partially completed, and it is probable that passages intended for it survive in V. If it was written at all, it must have belonged to the same period as III., and have been very much like III. in general style.

¹ "Das fünfter Buch der Aeneis," *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasial-Wesen*, xxxiii., p. 641 (Berlin, 1879). The substance of Conrads's theory is given in some detail by Kettner, Ribbeck (*Prolegomena*, c. vi.), and Conington (*P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*, Introduction to III. and V.).

The Growth of the Aeneid

This book must have opened with the visit to Acestes. There would be some account of the descent of Acestes and the foundation of a Trojan colony in Sicily. This would be followed by the death of Anchises, which would probably be told with some detail, as the central event of the book. It could hardly be passed over in a few lines in the poet's narrative, though such a treatment is quite natural in Aeneas' narrative in III. The funeral and the games in honour of Anchises would be a necessary sequel. Meanwhile the Trojan women would burn the ships. The vision of Anchises and the founding of Acesta would follow very much as they do in V. Finally, the book would end with the departure of the Trojans from Sicily. The present First Book stood next, probably beginning at 34.¹

The first part of this old Second Book has entirely disappeared, but references to it are found in I.² There must have been a fairly full account of the Trojan colony at Eryx, for Vergil always gives a full account of the past history of any city which is important in the poem.³ The death of Anchises is told very briefly in the lines added to the end of III. This brevity seems to be intentional. The bond between Anchises and Aeneas was a very close one,

¹ The explanatory paragraph about Carthage (12-33) is unnecessary, as the founding of Carthage is fully described by Venus, 338-368.

² I. 34, 195, 549-558.

³ Cf. I. 338-368, on the founding of Carthage, and VII. 45-106, on the previous history of Latium.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

and this is all the more apparent because Vergil touches it so delicately. The depth and intimacy of their affection is only shown in a few short passages, yet it pervades the whole Aeneid. Thus Vergil may have felt the difficulty of writing any account of the death of Anchises which would not fail utterly. It must have all the beauty and tenderness which we find in such passages as those which deal with the deaths of Dido and Euryalus, and in addition the deeper feeling which comes out in such lines as:

Et me, quem dudum non tulla iniecta movebant
Tela neque adverso glomerati ex agmine Grai,
Nunc omnes terrent aerae, sonus excitat omnis
Suspensum et pariter comitique onerique timentem;¹

or as:

Ille meum comitatus iter maria omnia mecum
Atque omnis pelagique minas caelique ferebat
Invalidus, viris ultra sortemque senectae;²

or in the words which Aeneas, thinking of his own father, speaks over the body of Lausus.³

We may perhaps find here one motive for the change of plan. If Vergil felt, as he may well have done, that any account of the death of Anchises might easily fail to be effective, he must also have realized that the only way to avoid the description of it was to include it in the narrative of Aeneas.

¹ II. 726-729. Cf. also 560, where Anchises is his first thought.

² VI. 112-114.

³ X. 825-830.

The Growth of the Aeneid

Thus the detailed account of the old Second Book was replaced by the closing lines of III.¹

It is impossible to say with any certainty how far V. 42-603 represents the original account of Anchises' funeral. It seems most likely that, if this account was written at all, it was considerably less elaborate than that of the funeral games in V. The games would have formed only an incident, and would have been disproportionate at their present length, whereas in V. they are the subject of the book. The actual funeral rites, too, would have been given in detail. On the whole, this part of V. seems to be entirely new; the style is much more like that of the later books than of III., and the artistic level is high.²

The burning of the ships by the Trojan women was an essential part of the legend. The place varies in the different versions, some authors placing it in Greece, others in Italy.³ Vergil probably

¹ Gercke (*Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, c. ii., p. 27) calls these lines "a very weak tibicen," and contrasts the tenderness with which the deaths of other characters are described. He entirely fails to see that any account of the death of Anchises must transcend all these or be utterly weak and inartistic. The breaking down of Aeneas at this point is perhaps the most beautiful and human touch in the Third Book.

² The boat-race (124-243) is one of the most vigorous pieces of description in the Aeneid.

³ Gercke holds that Vergil originally connected it with the landing in Italy, since both visits to Sicily were a late addition. This theory entirely overlooks the fact that the Aeneas legend was closely connected with the cult of

The Present Form of the Aeneid

located it in Sicily from a feeling that the Sicilian scenes were rather lacking in incident.¹ From this point to the departure from Sicily (604-778) the narrative seems to follow the original plan very closely, and may indeed be a corrected version of it.² In 613-4 the Trojan women are lamenting over the loss of Anchises; this would more naturally apply to the actual funeral. The difficulty of the time in 626 is removed if we suppose this passage to have originally preceded the visit to Carthage. The vision of Anchises also falls into its natural place; he will still guide Aeneas, and he tells him here how to gain the fuller revelation of his destiny.³

At 778 the material of the old Second Book comes to an end. The rest of V. deals with the voyage to Italy and the loss of Palinurus. This passage in

Aphrodite in Sicily. *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, c. ii., pp. 25-26, and c. vii., pp. 163-176.

¹ Dionysius Halicarnasensis also placed it in Sicily (I. 52).

² Juno's complaint in I. 39-41 is much more effective if it refers to an actual attempt to burn the Trojan ships. Kettner quotes X. 36-41 as giving the original order of Juno's misdeeds. He holds that the mission of Allecto, though not the latest in point of time, is kept until the last as a climax. This may be so, but it is equally possible that Vergil was not thinking of chronological order at all.

³ Critics who uphold the view that the whole Nekyia is a late addition maintain that this vision is also late, and make a good deal of the fact that Helenus only tells Aeneas to seek the Cumaeen Sibyl. But the vision of Anchises is closely connected with the foundation of Acesta, which certainly belonged to the original plan, and the gradual revelation is very characteristic. See p. 17.

The Growth of the Aeneid

its present form is certainly later than VI.; yet the Palinurus episode must have belonged to the original story, for the promontory of Palinurus was associated with the name of the pilot of Aeneas, and Vergil could hardly have omitted to mention it. The earlier version of the incident is that of VI., and probably another account, agreeing with it, existed before V. was composed. This account has entirely disappeared and V. 833-871 has been substituted, but Palinurus' story in VI. has not been harmonized with it. The speeches of Venus and Neptune may still be in their original form.

Some account of the voyage must have stood between IV. and VI. as we have them now, and must have formed a part of one of them. On the whole, it is more likely that IV. did not originally end with the death of Dido, but continued the adventures of Aeneas up to the landing at Cumae. This theory is supported by two facts:

1. IV. is unusually short: it contains only 705 lines as against an average length of 824 lines.¹ VI., on the other hand, contains 901 lines. Thus 100 lines could very easily be added to IV., but not to VI.

2. On the evidence of Servius the two opening lines of VI. were removed from the end of the preceding book. This points to the fact that the break

¹ The only other books which fall considerably below the average are III., which is unrevised, and VIII. I. also, which is among the shorter books, is one which seems to have received little revision.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

in the narrative always came at the point of the landing in Italy. These two lines, then, were either the original ending of IV., or more probably were written at the close of the latest version of the Palinurus episode.¹ It has already been pointed out that the opening of VI. must have been altered when V. was inserted.

The original ending of IV. was probably as follows:

The Trojans, on leaving Carthage, were overtaken by a storm.² Venus, becoming anxious, entreated Neptune to calm the waves and bring the fleet in safety to Italy. Neptune promised his help, on condition that one life only should be lost. Meanwhile, the rudder of Aeneas' ship was broken off and Palinurus was thrown into the sea.³ The storm was then calmed by Neptune and the fleet reached Cumae in safety.⁴

For all practical purposes, then, V. is a new book, in which the main part of the old Second Book has

¹ The reason for attaching them to VI. rather than V. is obvious: the last two lines of V. form a perfect ending.

² V. 1-11. These lines may belong to the original version.

³ The god of sleep belongs to the later version. In VI. 348 Palinurus denies that he was thrown into the sea by a god.

⁴ The oracle of Apollo referred to in VI. 343-347 cannot be placed with any certainty. If the mention of it in VI. is not a mere oversight, it must have been given before the departure from Sicily. It would seem to belong to the earliest conception of the story, in which Apollo and not Venus was the guide of the Trojans. It may well have belonged to the old Second Book, in which Juno was already beginning to play a prominent part, but Venus was still unimportant.

The Growth of the Aeneid

been rewritten and grafted on to the old end of IV., which has also been to a great extent, if not entirely, rewritten. Thus, V. is exactly the converse of III.: III. represents the original First Book slightly altered and then rejected; V. represents the old Second Book rejected and then rewritten.

In its present form V. seems to be practically complete, for in cases of inconsistency, since V. contains the latest version, we must suppose that the corresponding passages in other books would have been altered. There are seven unfinished lines, if "luduntque per undas" of 595, which is omitted in several MSS., is really spurious. These lines tend to occur in pairs; there are two in the foot-race,¹ two in the Ludus Troianus,² and two in the conversation of Venus and Neptune.³ This suggests that these paragraphs still required further revision, but that the rest is complete. The remaining one, "Haec effata,"⁴ is of a common type, being simply a note at the end of a speech.

V. is believed to be later than IX. on the ground that Nisus and Euryalus are introduced very briefly in V.,⁵ while in IX.⁶ a full description of them is given, as though they had not been mentioned before. This might perhaps be paralleled by the brief description of Camilla in VII.⁷ and the much longer

¹ 294 and 322.

² 574 and 595, if the last half is spurious.

³ 792 and 815.

⁴ 653.

⁵ 294-296.

⁶ 176-183.

⁷ 803-817.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

account in XI.,¹ but, as V. is in any case late, it is most probable that IX. is the earlier. Indeed, the unfinished line (V. 294) suggests that the description here is incomplete, and that Vergil would have transferred to this place the necessary information from IX.²

¹ 535-584.

² For the question of the date of V., see p. 112.

CHAPTER III

THE PRESENT FORM OF THE AENEID: VII.-XII.

THE last six books of the Aeneid are of considerably less importance than the first six for determining questions of date and construction. Apart from the difficulties raised by the eating of the tables in VII. and the appearance of the white sow in VIII., these books contain no striking inconsistencies, either as regards one another, or with the earlier books. These two passages have already been discussed in their relation to III.; they probably represent the final version, and therefore have no bearing on the general composition of the second half of the Aeneid.

Gercke's theory¹ that VII.-XII. are earlier than I.-VI. has been mentioned. He supposes that Vergil set out to write an epic, beginning with the landing of Aeneas in Italy, and that the earlier incidents were added after VII.-XII. were substantially complete. There are, however, two objections to this theory which seem absolutely final. The first is the statement of Suetonius that Vergil

¹ See p. 13.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

from the very beginning had planned the Aeneid in twelve books, and had sketched out the plot in prose before beginning to write.¹ This statement is plain and straightforward, and the words cannot be twisted into any other meaning; it must either be accepted as it stands or discarded entirely.

The second objection to Gercke's theory lies in the fact that the second half of the Aeneid shows evidence of an advance in power of construction and technical skill. There is no study in the Aeneid more interesting than this gradual development of technique, and it is worth while to consider it in some detail.

An attempt has been made in dealing with the separate books to show that in the earliest parts of the poem the construction is loose, and that inconsistencies occur frequently. Again, in I. and III. there are many evidences of modification of the original plan. In VI. Vergil has finally perfected his technique, and in the later books the technical faults are few and unimportant. This technical development can be clearly observed in comparing III. with VIII. Both these books consist of a series of loosely connected incidents, and on the whole the material of III. is more promising than that of VIII. Yet III. is unsatisfactory; the different incidents of the voyage are left sketchy and disconnected, and two of them—the prophecy of Helenus and the rescue of Achaemenides—are disproportionately long. VIII., on the other hand, shows an enormous

¹ Sueton., 23.

The Growth of the Aeneid

advance in technical power. The different incidents are woven together with great skill; perhaps the most striking example of this is shown by the two passages dealing with the armour of Aeneas. The first of these is made to occupy the night which Aeneas spends with Evander, and thus falls at a natural break in the narrative. The second, containing the description of the shield, might be felt to be disproportionate in length to the rest of the book, were it not for the extraordinary skill with which it is worked in. It is not only that the reader is carried away by the sheer magnificence of the description; by introducing the great scenes from Roman history, Vergil has actually made it the climax of the whole book. Again, the story of Hercules and Cacus has very little connection with the rest of the book. Vergil was undoubtedly influenced here and elsewhere by the Alexandrian practice of digressions; but his technique has become so perfect that the reader does not feel that the digression is inappropriate. In dealing with such material a less skilful writer would probably have produced a series of disconnected passages, good enough in themselves but not forming a united whole.

Not only are the separate books constructed with great care and attention to detail, but in VII.-XII. the unity of the whole is very carefully kept in sight. The plot is by no means simple, consisting as it does of many episodes, and shifting rapidly from place to place; but the unity of action is preserved

The Present Form of the Aeneid

throughout in the character of Lavinia. The Latin princess, it is true, is a somewhat shadowy figure, but the question of her marriage is kept constantly before the reader. It has been foreshadowed in the allusions in II. and VI.;¹ it is the main theme in the earlier part of VII., which acts as a link between the two parts of the poem; and through all the struggles that follow it is never forgotten.²

It has been shown that in the earlier books the chronology is in hopeless confusion. In the later books it is worked out very carefully; the time allowed is occasionally rather short; the Trojan camp, for example, seems to have been designed and elaborately fortified in two days; but there is no difficulty in drawing up a scheme and assigning each event to its proper day; the action from the landing in Latium to the death of Turnus occupies twenty-one days. In dealing with changes of place Vergil has for the most part been extremely careful to reach a suitable pause in the narrative before turning to a different scene. Thus, Aeneas makes his two

¹ II. 783-4; VI. 93-4, 764.

² Gercke believes that in the earliest version the marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia was not suggested until the council in XI. He concludes that a good deal of VII. was added subsequently and that all the references to the marriage in IX. and X. were added at the same time. But the rivalry between Aeneas and Turnus for the hand of Lavinia and the succession to the kingdom of Latinus was part of the legend, and can hardly have been an afterthought; and the parallel between the Trojan and Italian wars, both fought for the sake of a woman, was in Vergil's mind when he wrote VI. 83-94.

The Growth of the Aeneid

voyages by night, the first occupying the period of inaction before the Latin attack, the second the night following the escape of Turnus from the Trojan camp. The account of the attack on the Trojans in the absence of Aeneas is not given until Aeneas has safely reached the Etruscan camp. Other instances of the same careful arrangement might be given.

It seems certain that Vergil treated the accepted tradition with great freedom. The main outlines, as given by extant authorities, are as follows: Aeneas was kindly received by Latinus, and a treaty was concluded between the Latins and the Trojans, by which Lavinia became the wife of Aeneas, the new city being called Lavinium.¹ In the fourth year the Rutulians, who as subjects of Latinus had been included in the treaty, revolted, and chose as their leader Turnus, the rejected suitor of Lavinia. In the battle which followed Latinus and Turnus were killed. The defeated Rutulians then made an alliance with Mezentius² and the Etruscans. They were again defeated, but Aeneas disappeared in or after the battle. This is the

¹ Livy records another tradition that Aeneas first defeated Latinus in battle and then made a treaty with him. Dio Cassius also follows this version.

² The fate of Mezentius seems to have been a matter of some doubt. Dionysius narrates that his son, Lausus, was killed in a later battle against Ascanius, but that Mezentius made a treaty with the Latins. Servius (*in Aen.* VI. 760) says "primo bello periit Latinus, secundo pariter Turnus et Aeneas, postea Mezentium interemit Ascanius." His authority is Cato.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

account of Dionysius.¹ Livy's story agrees with it in the main, but represents Turnus as escaping after the first battle and making an alliance with Mezentius.

Vergil has modified this tradition in two ways: he has rearranged the details in such a way as to give a greater unity to the whole, and he has added other elements, either invented by himself or representing an entirely foreign tradition.

The changes in the accepted tradition are mainly chronological. The time is shortened from several years to twenty-one days,² and the order of events is altered, the death of Turnus being reserved for the climax. Latinus survives the battle; Mezentius and Lausus are killed by Aeneas.

To this modification of the original legend Vergil has united the story of the Arcadian settlement on the Palatine. It seems fairly certain that there was no connection originally between Evander and the Trojans, for no mention of such a connection is made by any extant authority.³ The account of the Arcadian colony does not differ from that of other authors except in the fact that Vergil makes Pallas the son of Evander, whereas Dionysius and Servius

¹ Dion. Hal., I. 57 ff.

² See note on the chronology at the end of this chapter.

³ The passage in the *Fasti* (l. 519-524) where Pallas is connected with Aeneas is probably in imitation of the Aeneid. Ovid does not seem to invent new legends, but he often adopts Vergil's modifications of existing ones, so that we cannot assume here that he was dealing with an actual tradition.

The Growth of the Aeneid

record that he was the son of Hercules and Lavinia, the daughter of Evander. Dionysius states that he died young, Servius that he was killed "post mortem patris seditione."¹

The alliance of the Etruscans with the Trojans seems also to be Vergil's own. In the historians Mezentius is king of the Etruscans and joins the Rutulians because he fears that the foundation of a new city may endanger his own power.

On VIII. 492-3—

Ille inter caedem Rutulorum elapsus in agros
Confugere et Turni defendier hospitibus armis

Servius has a note: "Et vertit historiam; nam, ut diximus, Turnus magis confugit ad Mezentium."

The introduction of Juturna as the sister and protector of Turnus may also be due to Vergil. Ovid, indeed, addresses her as "Turni soror,"² but he is probably following Vergil, for when he tells her story she is a river nymph, beloved by Juppiter, and there is no trace of Vergil's story that Juppiter made her immortal in return for her love. It is, however, possible that Vergil was following a tradition now lost.

A detailed analysis would be required to show how skilfully the various legends are worked in, and it is unnecessary to follow out all the details here. We have no means of knowing whether the plot of the last six books as they now stand is identical

¹ Dion. Hal., I. 32; cf. 43. Serv., in *Aen.* VIII. 51.

² *Fasti* I. 463.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

with that of the prose sketch or not; but we may reasonably suppose that a certain amount of alteration took place. But whereas in the first six books it is possible to find traces of alteration and even to form a theory of the process, we can find no certain traces of an older version in the last six books. The plot is worked out without any of the weakness or inconsistency which is occasionally found in the earlier books.

It has often been said that the greater unity of VII.-XII. is due to the fact that the action is more concentrated, covering, as it does, a short period of time and taking place within a limited space. There is no doubt some truth in this; but it should be remembered that the unity of action is largely due to Vergil's bold rearrangement of events. His technique has become so perfect that the casual reader does not realize how carefully and elaborately the work has been done. It is only by close reading of the whole Aeneid that the extraordinary increase of technical power can be realized. The earliest work in III. is faulty and badly proportioned; in the books which follow Vergil is feeling his way, and in I., and still more in IV., we may see the technical skill growing side by side with the poetic power. His constructive power rises to its greatest height in the single books II. and VI.¹ Finally, in the last half of the poem we find that the separate books are

¹ The end of the Fourth Georgic should probably be included here. V. seems to be considerably later. See p. 112.

The Growth of the Aeneid

united into a whole, which is almost entirely free from errors in construction.¹

Though the second half of the Aeneid is superior in unity, on the whole its general poetic level is lower than that of the first half. This does not seem to be due to any decline in Vergil's imaginative power. There are many passages of great beauty: the story of Nisus and Euryalus in IX., the deaths of Lausus and Camilla in X. and XI., and the final combat of Aeneas and Turnus in XII., are among Vergil's greatest achievements. Yet, with the exception of VIII., none of the later books keeps the reader's interest sustained throughout as it is sustained in II., IV., and VI.

This occasional lack of interest is not due to any fault in technique. There seem to be two causes in the subject of the poem itself. The first is that

¹ Vergil himself evidently realized that in the last half of the Aeneid he had completely mastered the rules of epic construction. Twice at least he looks forward with confidence to the immortality of his work, and the glory he can confer. In IX. there is a very striking passage:

Fortunati ambo ! si quid mea carmina possunt,
Nulla dies unquam memori vos eximet aevo,
Dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
Accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.

(IX. 446-449.)

In X. 791-793 there is the same feeling:

Hic mortis durae casum tuaque optima facta,
Si qua fidem tanto est operi latura vetustas,
Non equidem nec te, iuvenis memorande, silebo.

The tone of these lines is very different from that of the earlier despairing letter to Augustus. See p. 13, n.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

the incidents which appealed most to Vergil's imagination to a great extent fall within the earlier books. Aeneas as a fugitive and an exile is much more interesting to Vergil than when he reaches the promised land and overcomes his enemies. Thus in the last six books Vergil rises to his greatest height in incidental passages rather than in whole books.

The second cause is Vergil's inability to make the battle scenes convincing. He was probably well aware of this: Dr. Warde Fowler has pointed out how constantly he tries to "escape his fate—the necessity of describing Homeric battles."¹ Even in the Iliad there is little interest for the modern reader in the long lists of men slain by Agamemnon or Achilles, and Vergil, who had experienced the brutal side of war, and who could never forget the misery and desolation caused by it in his own time, could not realize in his descriptions the joy of battle which relieves the ἀπιστεῖναι of the Homeric heroes.² The greatness of such passages as those which deal with the deaths of Camilla and Lausus lies in their pathos, and we have no feeling of joy in the triumph of the conqueror: our sympathy is with the fallen.³

¹ *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*, Introduction.

² Napoleon in comparing Homer and Vergil declared that Homer had made war, but that Vergil "did not know what an army was."

³ In the case of the death of Turnus the mention of Pallas saves the Aeneid from ending on a wrong note. It recalls not only Evander's prayer for vengeance, but also the devastation and misery caused by the violence of Turnus. But there is no feeling of triumph in the passage; Aeneas rather performs an act of justice in killing Turnus.

The Growth of the Aeneid

In dealing with the separate books it is not easy to judge how far the work is complete or to find evidence of insertion or excision. But a few points may be noted, though great caution is necessary in drawing conclusions.

The Seventh Book falls naturally into two parts, the first consisting of the landing in Latium and the causes of the war, the second of the so-called catalogue. This second part seems to be practically complete. Dr. Warde Fowler in his commentary¹ has shown very clearly how carefully it is constructed. It contains two unfinished lines,² both of which may have been left owing to a difficulty in completing the passages at the moment. It is possible that the catalogue was written at a different date from the rest of the book, but there is no evidence for such a view, as its superior construction may be the result of revision.

The earlier part of the book reads in some ways like a first draft. The opening lines are extremely beautiful, but there is rather a drop in interest after the exordium. The action moves rather slowly, and the book is a little overweighted by the divine machinery. The simile in which Amata is compared with a top³ is not very appropriate to its context, though vigorous enough in itself. The scene in which Allecto appears to Turnus seems incomplete, as it contains two unfinished lines.⁴ Two others occur: one at the end of Ilioneus' speech to

¹ *Vergil's "Gathering of the Clans."*

² 702 and 760.

³ 378-383.

⁴ 439 and 455.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

Latinus,¹ the other in the middle of a speech of Aeneas.² Except for these unfinished lines there is no definite mark of incompleteness, but the general style suggests that the "ultima manus" is wanting. This is not unnatural, since the first part of VII. forms the transition between the two parts of the Aeneid, and would thus be likely to be left untouched until the rest of the poem was complete. It was also one of the less interesting parts of the poem, and it is very probable that Vergil intended it as a first version, on which he could work later.

The Eighth Book, considered as a whole, is perhaps the most beautiful of the last six. It seems also to be fairly complete; there are only three unfinished lines, one of which³ introduces a speech. Dr. Warde Fowler, in his analysis of the shield,⁴ mentions Nettleship's suggestion that the lines dealing with the Battle of Actium were not originally written for the Aeneid but for an earlier poem in praise of Augustus.⁵ He also points out the contrast between the finish of these lines and the roughness of those which describe the rest of the shield. If Nettleship's suggestion be accepted, we may say that Vergil used the description of the Battle of Actium as his climax, but joined it on rather

¹ 248.

² 129.

³ 469.

⁴ *Aeneas at the Site of Rome*, pp. 100 ff.

⁵ If such a poem existed, Propertius may be referring to it in II. 34. 61-2, which are generally understood as referring to the passage in Aen. VIII.:

Actia Vergilio, custodis litora Phoebi,
Caesaris et fortis dicere posse rates.

The Growth of the Aeneid

hurriedly, intending to enlarge and polish the preceding passage later.

There are six unfinished lines in IX., but otherwise no striking signs of incompleteness. Vergil does not seem very clear as to the nature of the Trojan camp. He twice calls it "urbs" in this book,¹ and refers to a tower,² a gate, and fortified walls;³ yet it is only four days since the Trojans landed. Later, in X. and XI., it seems to be a camp.⁴ This is perhaps due to carelessness, but Vergil, when he wrote IX., may have intended to use a version in which the city was built before the war began.

There are a number of difficulties in X. which point to want of revision. None of them are very important, and they seem on the whole to be the result of careless writing.

There are some obscure points connected with the voyage along the Etruscan coast. After a short description of the Trojan camp, Vergil returns to Aeneas:

Ille inter sese duri certamina belli

*Contulerant: media Aeneas freta nocte secabat.*⁵

After a few lines describing the voyage the catalogue of the Etruscan chiefs is introduced. Then follow the lines—

¹ 48 and 729.

² 530.

³ 675-6.

⁴ Tandem erumpunt et castra relinquunt
Ascanius puer et nequiquam obsessa iuventus.

(X. 604-5.)

Castra Aeneas aciemque movebat" (XI. 446).

Towers are, however, mentioned in X. 121.

⁵ X. 146-7.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

Iamque dies caelo concesserat almaque curru
Noctivago Phoebe mediam pulsabat Olympum :
Aeneas (neque enim membris dat cura quietem)
Ipse sedens clavumque regit velisque ministrat.¹

These two passages refer to the same night, but seem to have been written independently of one another; it is hardly natural to begin by declaring it to be midnight, and then, in speaking of the same night and scene, to say that day had departed. Again, in the first of these two passages Pallas is with Aeneas;² in the second he is not mentioned; and it is perhaps implied that Aeneas is alone when his old ships appear to him as nymphs. The ship of Aeneas, too, causes some difficulty; it is described as having the Phrygian lions and Ida as a figure-head,³ yet it cannot be a Trojan ship, for Aeneas has reached the Etruscan coast by land. The early commentators evidently felt the difficulty. Servius notes: "Sane notatur a criticis Vergilius hoc loco, quemadmodum sic cito dixit potuisse navis Aeneae fieri: quod excusat pictura, quam solam mutatam debemus accipere. Ergo hanc navem Aeneae ab Etruscis datam intellegamus. Quidam volunt hanc navem ex his esse quibus Aeneas ad Euandrum erat evectus, et ad Etruriam terra esse portatam."⁴ Both explanations are improbable;

¹ X. 215-218.

² 160.

³ Aeneia puppis

Prima tenet rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones,
Imminet Ida super, profugis gratissima Teucris.

(X. 156-158.)

⁴ Serv., in *Aen.* X. 157.

The Growth of the Aeneid

it is far more likely that Vergil was writing carelessly.

The nymph Cymodocea, after telling Aeneas of the siege of his camp, says:

Iam loca iussa tenet forti permixtus Etrusco
Arcas eques; medias illis opponere turmas,
Ne castris iungant, certa est sententia Turno.¹

We are not told anywhere of the despatch of this cavalry, and, though it may easily be inferred from these lines, especially as we have heard of the cavalry given to Aeneas by Evander, we should perhaps have expected some mention of it earlier. The description of the alliance between Aeneas and Tarcho² is very brief and sketchy, and would perhaps have been elaborated. Perhaps the most simple explanation of the difficulties of this passage is that Vergil wrote 146-162 as a brief description of the voyage, and afterwards elaborated it, first by the insertion of the Etruscan catalogue, and secondly by the appearance of the nymphs to Aeneas. But the evidence is far too slender for any certainty in drawing conclusions.

The general conception of the battle is fairly clear, and here, as in all his battle scenes, Vergil avoids details of strategy and topography. The only difficulty lies in the fact that Pallas, who had been with Aeneas during the voyage, is found later with the Arcadian cavalry, who had come by land.³ The truth probably is that Vergil conceived the

¹ X. 238-240.

² X. 148-156.

³ X. 365.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

general situation, but did not trouble himself about the details, and perhaps would not have done so even in the finished version.

There is a sudden introduction of Juturna in 439; she has not been mentioned before, but is here referred to as the sister of Turnus without further explanation. She does not appear again until the Twelfth Book, where the outlines of her story are given.¹ Vergil must have regarded her as a familiar figure when he wrote this passage, so that it may be later than those in which Juturna appears in XII.

The characters of Aeneas and Turnus in this book are not quite consistent with those portrayed in XII. Dr. Warde Fowler in *The Death of Turnus* dwells constantly on the deliberate contrasting of the two characters. At the end of XII. it is the thought of Pallas which makes Aeneas disregard the prayer of Turnus. We should thus have expected that the "violentia" of Turnus would be particularly manifest when he kills Pallas. But on the whole he behaves with considerable moderation. The killing of Pallas is not a crime but a necessity; it is exactly parallel to the killing of Lausus by Aeneas; in both cases a young, untried man is slain by a proved hero. Again, Turnus does not exceed his rights in taking the belt, for Aeneas in the same way takes the armour of Mezentius.² The message sent to Evander is quite moderate in tone:

¹ XII. 138-141.

² XI. 6-7. He leaves Lausus his armour, but that is a special favour.

The Growth of the Aeneid

"Arcades haec," inquit, "memores mea dicta referte
Euandro: qualem meruit, Pallanta remitto.
Quisquis honos tumuli, quidquid solamen humandi est,
Largior. . . ."¹

The only passage in which Turnus shows real brutality is that in which he demands that Pallas should be reserved for him:

Soli mihi Pallas
Debetur; cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset.²

As Turnus is not savage enough, so Aeneas is too savage. The hundred lines following the death of Pallas³ show in him a spirit quite foreign to his character elsewhere. Like Achilles, he reserves captives to be sacrificed at the tomb of Pallas;⁴ he disregards the most solemn prayers,⁵ and taunts his fallen foes.⁶ That he should be roused by grief to fierce indignation is natural enough, but the whole passage is too violent, and requires toning down. We may suppose that in revising the book Vergil would have brought both characters more into keeping with the general conception of them.

¹ X. 491-494. There is some question as to the meaning of "qualem meruit." Nettleship renders, "such as Evander deserved to see him after his alliance with Aeneas" (Conington's *Vergil*, note on line 492). But Henry's interpretation (*Aeneidea*, vol. iv., p. 75), that "meruit" refers to the honourable death which Pallas had earned by his bravery, seems more natural, and agrees better with the following lines.

² X. 442-3. ³ X. 510-605. ⁴ X. 517-520.
⁵ X. 531-534, 599-600. ⁶ X. 557-560, 592-594.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

It is at least to be hoped that 517-520¹ would have been removed, but we hear later² of captives being sent with the body of Pallas to be sacrificed on the pyre; so that Vergil may have intended them to stand.³

Some statement seems to be required either at the end of X. or at the beginning of XI. about the flight of the Latins, but it is perhaps implied by the fall of Mezentius.

The Tenth Book is not one of the greater books, though it has some great passages, and ends magnificently with the deaths of Lausus and Mezentius. On the whole it seems to have been little revised. The difficulties mentioned above are all such as might occur in a first draft. There are six unfinished lines, three of which introduce speeches. Vergil has also used eight times in this book a rhythm which he usually avoids—a strong caesura in the fifth foot. This is admitted after a monosyllable or before a Greek quadrisyllable, but is very rare

¹ Sulmone creatos
Quattuor hic iuvenes, totidem quos educat Vfers,
Viventis rapit, inferias quos immolet umbris
Captivoque rogi perfundat sanguine flammās.

² XI. 81-2.

³ In this passage Vergil is decidedly unfortunate in his imitation of the Iliad. Aeneas has all the violence of Achilles after the death of Patroclus. But the fierce grief of Achilles is in keeping with his character, and his brutality can be understood and even excused on the score of long and intimate friendship. Aeneas has no such motive for violence, since he does not stand in the same relation to Pallas as Achilles does to Patroclus.

The Growth of the Aeneid

elsewhere. The Eclogues contain no example, the Georgics only three; no other book of the Aeneid contains more than two, and in VI. and XII., which are believed to be the most finished, no example occurs. The comparatively large number in X. again points to incompleteness.

The Eleventh Book seems fairly complete; most of it reaches a high poetic level, and there are only two unfinished lines. There seem, however, to be some omissions. There is no mention of Mezentius and Lausus in the account of the funeral rites, although we should have expected some reference after Mezentius' prayer in X. 906 that he might share a grave with his son. Nor is there any certain reference to the disappearance of Turnus, though it might have been a very effective taunt in the mouth of Drances.¹ As Vergil in the last six books is generally careful in gathering up the threads of the narrative, it may be that X. is partly or entirely later than XI.

An omission may also be implied by 741. Juppiter inspires Tarchon with fury against the enemy, and he denounces the cowardice of his followers.

Haec effatus equum in medios moriturus et ipse
Concitat.²

¹ Servius (*in Aen.* XI. 351) supposes that there is a reference to it in

dum Troia temptat
Castrâ fugae fidens.

But this would rather seem to refer to his escape from the camp at the end of IX.

² XI. 741-2.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

“*Moriturus*” is taken by the commentators as meaning “prepared for death.” Servius notes: “*Moriturus animo: nam moriturus non est.*” But it is very doubtful whether it can bear this meaning. Vergil uses it with some frequency, and always with the sense “destined to die,” or “to certain death.” It looks, then, as though Vergil had meant Tarcho to fall, perhaps at the hand of Camilla, but had omitted the account of his death. He certainly does not appear again, though he might be expected to be named among the leaders who were present at the making of the treaty in XII.

Of the last six books XII. seems on the whole to be the most complete. It contains only one unfinished line,¹ and in general is elaborately worked out. It is perhaps rather too long; Dr. Warde Fowler remarks that “the tragic conclusion seems too long delayed as it stands.”² There is a curious inconsistency with regard to time at the beginning; we hear at the end of XI.³ that the sun had set; Turnus returns to the city, and holds a conversation with Latinus. It is still evening, for Turnus speaks of the treaty which is to be made on the following day—

Cum primum crastina caelo
Puniceis invecta rotis Aurora rubebit.⁴

He then calls for his horses and arms himself for the fight. Aeneas also prepares for battle. All this

¹ 631.

² *The Death of Turnus*, p. 39.

³ XI. 913-4.

⁴ XII. 76-7.

The Growth of the Aeneid

apparently takes place in the evening, for we are told later—

*Postera vix summos spargebat lumine montis
Orta dies.*¹

Turnus and Aeneas, then, arm on the evening before the battle.

It is most reasonable to suppose that this difficulty is due to the insertion of a paragraph. Vergil would hardly have made the mistake if he had written the passage in its present order. But if 82-112 were inserted at a later date he might easily have forgotten or omitted to alter 113-115. 82-112 are not necessary to the narrative, and may easily have been added later.

There is no means of forming a satisfactory conclusion as to the relative dates of the last six books. It is most probable that they were written in the order in which they now stand. It is noticeable that the number of similes increases towards the end of the Aeneid,² and this may be a sign of late work; if so, VII. and VIII. are certainly earlier than IX.-XII.; but it must be remembered that Vergil uses every means to vary his battle scenes, and the large number of similes in the later books may be due to this. It has been shown that the end of X. may be later than XI., because important events narrated in it are not mentioned in XI.,³ but the death of Pallas can hardly be later than the death

¹ XII. 113-4.

² Of the 102 similes in the Aeneid 51 occur in IX.-XII.

³ See p. 94.

The Present Form of the Aeneid

of Turnus, for, as has been mentioned, the presentation of Turnus in X. is not savage enough to account for the anger of Aeneas in XII. at the thought of Pallas. On the whole, in the absence of any certain evidence to the contrary, it is best to assume that these six books were written in the order in which they now stand, each one receiving more or less subsequent modification. For the details of such modification there is scarcely any evidence.

There are reasonable grounds for supposing that V. is later than IX. This question will be discussed in detail later,¹ but it may be remarked here that the connection between the last four books is very close, and would seem to denote that they were written in succession; thus, if V. is later than IX., it is in all probability the latest book of all.

One very interesting question remains: Did Vergil intend the Aeneid to end as it now does, with the death of Turnus? It is certainly unusual in ancient art to end at the climax, and Vergil, in the books which work up to a culminating-point, always adds a calm close. The climax of II. falls comparatively early at the death of Priam. In IV. the highest emotional point is reached when Dido stabs herself, and the forty lines which follow bring the book to a quiet ending. Even in VI. the great

Heu, miserande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas
Tu Marcellus eris

is succeeded by the quiet, level lines of the close.

¹ See p. 112.

The Growth of the Aeneid

But in XII. the last six lines form the climax and the story breaks off abruptly. It may at least be said that such an ending is unlike Vergil.

On the other hand, the story is practically finished with the death of Turnus, and the end of XII., as it stands, is very fine. Whether Vergil originally intended to end at this point or not, he may have felt that any addition would be an anti-climax. It may then be argued that, if he had ever intended to touch on the events which followed the death of Turnus, he abandoned the intention, and preferred to leave the rest to the reader's imagination rather than weaken a splendid close.

NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF VII.-XI.—The days are reckoned from dawn to dawn:

Day 1: Landing in Latium (VII. 25-147).

Day 2: Embassy to Latinus. Juno sends Allecto to stir up war. Allecto appears to Turnus during the night. (VII. 148-466.)

Day 3: Preparations of Turnus. Battle with the shepherds. Muster of the Latins. Tiber appears to Aeneas by night. Aeneas sets out before dawn for Pallanteum. (VII. 467-VIII. 93.)

Day 4: Visit of Aeneas to Evander (VIII. 94-453). First attack on Trojan camp and expedition of Nisus and Euryalus (IX. 1-458).

Day 5: Visit of Aeneas to the Etruscan camp (VIII. 454-731). Second attack on Trojan camp (IX. 459-818).

Day 6: Council of the gods. Third attack on

The Present Form of the Aeneid

Trojan camp. Voyage of Aeneas by night down the Etruscan coast. (X. 1-255.)

Day 7: Relief of Trojan camp. Deaths of Pallas, Lausus, and Mezentius. (X. 256-908.)

Day 8: Twelve days' truce agreed upon for the burial of the dead (XI. 1-224).

Day 20: Council of the Latins. March of Trojans on Laurentum and death of Camilla. Offer of terms to Aeneas. (XI. 225-XII. 112.)

Day 21: Treaty and death of Turnus (XII. 113-952).

CHAPTER IV

THE STAGES OF COMPOSITION

So far the *Aeneid* has been considered in its present form, and an attempt has been made to show how far the different books, as they now stand, contain evidence of earlier versions and conceptions. It now remains to deal with the question, how far the conclusions drawn from the separate books can lead us to a reconstruction of the earlier stages of the poem. The theory of reconstruction put forward in this chapter is a deduction drawn from the previous examination of the evidence. Since the conclusions on which it is based are largely conjectural, it follows that the deduction itself must also be mainly conjectural.

Three stages of construction have already been assumed: the prose sketch, the poem in the course of construction, and the present text.¹ The prose sketch rests on the authority of Suetonius, and may have been a brief synopsis or a fairly full outline. The second stage is rather a series of stages, on which it is impossible to speak dogmatically; it is, however, possible, by careful sifting of the available evidence,

¹ See p. 4.

The Stages of Composition

to construct a reasonable theory as to the dates and causes of the most important changes. The present text is due to the editors, but there is no reason to suppose that they deviated in any important respect from Vergil's arrangement, though they may have included work that Vergil had marked for excision. We may, then, assume that the present text represents Vergil's latest manuscript.

When the separate books are mentioned in this connection, it must be understood that the reference is not necessarily to the form in which they now stand, but rather to the general plan. Such a book as VI., for example, must have passed through many stages before reaching its present perfection; but the number may be conveniently used to comprise the main incidents which from the first belonged to the book in question.

For the sake of convenience the books of the version prior to the change of order will be indicated by small numerals, and those of the later version by capitals.¹

All that we know of the prose sketch is contained in the words of Suetonius: "*Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII. libros particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem arripiens.*"² This is very brief, but it establishes one important fact: the *Aeneid* was from the first divided into twelve books. If

¹ The theory of the change of order is assumed to be correct throughout this chapter.

² Sueton., 23.

The Growth of the Aeneid

Suetonius is to be trusted, no reconstruction can be correct which disregards this piece of evidence.

The main changes in the original plan have already been fully considered in relation to III. and V. If these conclusions be accepted, the original prose sketch of the first six books may be assumed to have been approximately as follows:

Book i. (present III.): The departure of the Trojans from Asia and their voyage to Sicily.

Book ii. (present V.): Entertainment of the Trojans by Acestes. Death and funeral of Anchises.

Book iii. (present I.): Storm caused by the anger of Juno. Landing in Africa. Entertainment of the Trojans by Dido, who asks Aeneas to tell his story.

Book iv. (present II.): The fall of Troy.

Book v. (present IV.): Dido's passion and death. Voyage to Cumae and loss of Palinurus.

Book vi. (present VI.): Consultation of the oracle at Cumae. Nekyia.

Only the essential points are given here; Vergil's synopsis would almost certainly be considerably more elaborate, and may have contained incidents of which the present text gives no hint. There remains, however, one important point: the patron of the Trojans in this earliest version was almost certainly Apollo, while Venus was a secondary figure, playing the part that Thetis plays in the *Iliad*. Juno was the chief opponent of Aeneas, but was considerably less prominent at this period than she became later. This is the position of the gods

The Stages of Composition

in III., and the constant references to Apollo in the first half of the Aeneid point to the same conclusion.

So far the period lying between the prose sketch and the present text has been considered as a single stage. In examining it in detail, however, it is more convenient to subdivide it into four stages as follows:

- (1) Composition of the original i.-vi.
- (2) Revision of i.-vi. and rejection of i. and ii.
- (3) Composition of VII.-XII.
- (4) Second revision of the whole poem.

These four periods must be examined in detail.

Of Vergil's methods of work we know this much: he wrote very slowly and carefully,¹ but did not necessarily follow the order of his sketch. The statement of Suetonius, however, seems to have given rise to some misunderstanding. He says that Vergil wrote "*prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens.*" This need mean nothing more than that, if a given incident, or even a long episode, was vividly present in his imagination, he wrote it down at once, quite irrespective of its relation to the rest of the poem. In fact it is probable that he did write many such passages before he attempted to put the poem together. But as soon as the main framework began to take shape in his mind, it is only reasonable to suppose that he began at the beginning, and worked straight through; at the same time he may well have continued to write single episodes.

¹ Sueton., 22.

The Growth of the Aeneid

This is the most natural way of dealing with an elaborate plot; sooner or later the poem must be considered as a whole, and the material must be worked through from the beginning.

We may, then, put aside the question of the order of the composition of single episodes, and consider only the process by which the complete books came into existence. We may suppose that Vergil began by writing a book about the voyage from Asia to Sicily. This book must have differed only in small points of wording from the present III. It began with the old exordium:

Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
Carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
Ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
Gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis¹
Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris

¹ Sueton., 42. Serv., in *Vita Verg.* and in *Aen.* I. 1. These lines seem to be genuine. There is no reason why an interpolator should have added them, and they are decidedly Vergilian in style. Moreover, they are very like the concluding lines of the Fourth Georgic in tone:

Haec super arborum cultu pecorumque canebar
Et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
Fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentis
Per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis aiebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
Carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

(Geor. IV. 559-566.)

Sabbadini compares Tibullus, II. 1. 53-4:

Et satur arenti primumst modulatus avena
Carmen.

The Stages of Composition

Italiam fato profugus Lavinaque venit
Litora—multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
Vi superum, saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
Multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
Inferretque deos Latio—genus unde Latinum
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.

On the whole these lines may be assumed to be early; the first four lines seem to have a slightly apologetic tone, as though the poet felt bound to lead up to his subject. Later, when he felt that the *Aeneid* needed no apology, he cut them out. The reference to Juno, the old enemy of Troy, is quite natural, even if Juno did not play a very prominent part; or the whole line may have been inserted later to lead up to the lines which follow in I.,¹ and which were certainly written after the change of order. The first three lines of III. are much more natural as the opening of the poem than as resumptive after the end of II.

Book ii. (present V.) was probably written, at least in part, at about the same period; it is impossible to speak with certainty, but it would seem probable that it was brought to about the same stage of completion as i. (present III.). It seems unlikely that Vergil would have proceeded straight from his first to his third book, leaving out a book which was not incidental, but an integral part of the story; and, judging by the references to events in Sicily in I., which represents original iii., it was certainly written before the rejection of the original ii. (represented by our V.), and in close connection with it.

¹ I. 12-33.

The Growth of the Aeneid

Book iii. (present I.) has already been treated in some detail. It began at line 34, and from that point onwards it still remains very much in the form in which it was originally written. It is in this book that Venus begins to develop into an important figure; she appears now, not only as the mother of Aeneas, but as the guide of the Trojans and the guardian of the future city. Juno remains malignant, as she was in the preceding book, but her interest in Carthage is so far only incidental; she has a temple there, and Venus fears that it may be dangerous for Aeneas to visit a city which Juno favours; but Juno's intention of making Carthage the ruler of the world belongs to a later date.¹

The next book (iv.—present II.) was, according to the prose sketch, Aeneas' narrative of the fall of Troy. It has already been stated² that this book would seem to have been written later than IV. (original v.); nor does this theory conflict with the natural order of writing; IV. (original v.) follows I. (original iii.) very closely, whereas II. (original iv.) is purely incidental. Vergil, therefore, left the incidental book on one side, and continued the story of Dido, which then formed part of v. To this was added the voyage from Carthage to Cumae and the death of Palinurus. In this book we see the divergence from the original plan increasing. Venus and Juno are now the directors of the plot, Juno striving to compass the sovereignty of Carthage by any

¹ See p. 33.

² See p. 60.

The Stages of Composition

means, Venus ruthlessly sacrificing the innocent Dido to the future greatness of Rome. Apollo becomes merely the god who gave the oracle to seek Italy. At the same time the geography has grown vague; the Trojans are now wandering in unknown seas seeking places called Italy and Latium. The familiar Mediterranean of III.¹ (original i.) has grown strange in I. and IV. (original iii. and v.).

After finishing the story of Dido Vergil would naturally proceed to block out iv. and vi. (present II. and VI.). These books were probably not brought to their present form until considerably later, but the account of Palinurus' death seems to show that VI., at any rate in part, belongs to the period prior to the rejection of the original ii. (now represented by V.).

At this point it would seem that Vergil stopped to make a preliminary revision, and it was in the course of this revision that he removed the two first books from their original place. The theory of a revision at this period may be based on two contentions: firstly, that the Aeneid falls naturally into two halves, and therefore Vergil would be likely, having roughly shaped out the first half, to go over it again, before setting to work on the second; secondly, VII. and VIII. must have been added after the rejection of III., since in these books incidents taken from III. are given in an entirely different form.²

The details of this revision are very difficult to

¹ See p. 20.

² See pp. 20-22.

The Growth of the Aeneid

determine, and the following hypothesis must be regarded as purely conjectural. It does, however, accord both with the scanty external evidence, and with that of the Aeneid itself.

Vergil's first feeling on rereading his work must have been that the arrangement was unsatisfactory. We have still two of the original first three books, i. and iii. (present III. and I.), and it is generally admitted that they are among the less interesting parts of the poem. The old Second Book probably fell short of both of them in artistic merit, and the reader would have found the three books of the voyage somewhat long and monotonous. On the other hand, iv., v., and vi. (present II., IV., and VI.), even at this date, must have been very much finer than the earlier books.

It was obviously necessary to shorten the narrative of the first three books, and Vergil's first move was to reject the Second Book entirely. His intention was probably to add a very brief account of the first landing in Sicily and the death of Anchises to the end of i. (present III.), and to gather sufficient material for a second visit to Sicily, which should stand in its present position between the death of Dido and the arrival of Aeneas in Italy. Either now or later the manuscript of ii. was destroyed by Vergil; it never fell into the hands of the editors.

The order of the first four books is now as follows:

Book i. (present III.): The departure of the

The Stages of Composition

Trojans from Asia and their voyage to Sicily.
Death of Anchises (?).¹

Book ii. (present I.): Storm. Landing in Africa.
Entertainment by Dido.

Book iii. (present II.): Fall of Troy.

Book iv. (present IV.): Passion and death of Dido.

It was, then, at this point that Vergil "recitavit primum libros tertium et quartum."² The third and fourth books of Servius are the second and fourth of Suetonius, but Servius is using an older tradition.

If this interpretation of Servius is correct, it becomes possible approximately to work out the chronology of the composition of the first half of the Aeneid. I., III., and IV., with the original ii., were written between 29 and 26 B.C.—that is, before the fall of Cornelius Gallus; they are all inferior *in construction* to the end of the Fourth Georgic, which cannot be earlier than 26 B.C. During this period Vergil was in correspondence with Augustus and wrote despondently of the greatness of his task. According to Suetonius, Augustus wrote repeatedly, demanding that extracts from the poem should be sent to him.³ Vergil's answer, preserved by Macrobius, has already been quoted.⁴

¹ This account of the death of Anchises was perhaps only intended, not actually written.

² Serv., *in Aen.* IV. 323.

³ "Augustus . . . supplicibus atque etiam minacibus per iocum litteris efflagitabat ut sibi 'de Aeneide' ut ipsius verba sunt 'vel prima carminis ὑπογραφὴ vel quodlibet colon mitteretur'" (Sueton., 31).

⁴ See p. 13, n. The fragments of this correspondence are believed to be genuine.

The Growth of the Aeneid

Augustus returned to Rome in 24 B.C., and it was probably soon after his return that the first reading took place. If Augustus had been so anxious to see some part of the Aeneid, it may be supposed that he took the first opportunity of hearing whatever Vergil considered sufficiently finished. Between 26 and 24 B.C. II. and part at any rate of VI. had been added, and Vergil chose II. (or iii., as it then was) and IV. as being the best of the books so far completed. VI. was probably still in a very elementary condition.

We may thus assume the beginning of 24 B.C. as the approximate date of the rejection of the original ii.

The second step in the revision was the removal of the original i. We can find two reasons for this change: firstly, that the account of the death of Anchises was probably less effective in its old place in ii. than in its present position at the end of III.;¹ secondly, that Vergil must have seen that it was a great gain from an artistic point of view to separate the present I. and III. by one of the greatest books of the Aeneid. The distribution of the great books in the first half of the Aeneid can hardly be accidental.

Vergil then went through the book, making only the alterations which were necessary for changing the narrative from the third to the first person. At the same time he added the final lines, and probably made one or two unimportant corrections. At this

¹ See p. 69.

The Stages of Composition

point he must have realized that he could not hope to make III. fit into his plan by mere verbal alterations. His whole conception had changed as the work proceeded; moreover, III. *as a whole* was unsatisfactory in spite of the great beauty of certain parts of it. As has been stated¹ earlier, he probably rejected it altogether; he did not, however, destroy the manuscript; there were many passages which he would have wished to incorporate in the second version.

The rejection of III. cannot have been very much later than that of the old Second Book. We may suppose that it took place in 24 B.C., and that the next year was spent in elaborating VI. Perhaps VII. and VIII. were also begun at this time. The new books which were to fill the gaps left by the rejected ones were put on one side for the present. VI. must have been fairly complete at the time of the death of Marcellus towards the end of 23 B.C., and was probably read to Augustus and Octavia before the end of the year. The incidents recorded by Suetonius² and Servius³ suggest that their loss was still recent.

The last three or four years were spent on the

¹ See pp. 38–39.

² "Recitavit . . . sextum: sed hunc notabili Octaviae adfectione, quae cum recitationi interesset, ad illos de filio suo versus 'Tu Marcellus eris' defecisse fertur atque aegre focolata est" (Sueton., 32).

³ "Constat hunc librum tanta pronuntiatione Augusto et Octaviae esse recitatum, ut fletu nimio imperarent silentium" (Serv., in *Aen.* VI. 861).

The Growth of the Aeneid

later books and on a second revision of the whole Aeneid. On the whole it is most likely that V. belongs to this second revision; it seems to be later than IX,¹ and the close connection between the last four books and their general similarity in style may well be due to continuous writing. Moreover, V. would naturally be left to the end. It was a difficult book to write, since the material was scanty and the incidents were few and—except for the burning of the ships—unexciting. It seems to have been finally put together by uniting the chief incidents of the original Second Book with the new account of the funeral games. The friendship of Nisus and Euryalus in IX. suggested a means of varying the athletic contests, and the book is brought to a solemn close by the episode of Palinurus, taken from its old place in IV. and rewritten. V. is not one of the greatest books of the Aeneid, but in no book has Vergil given a more striking example of his power of constructing a varied and artistic whole out of very slight materials.

The chronology, shortly summed up, is as follows:

29–26 B.C.: Original Aeneid i., ii., iii., v. (present III., V., I., IV.).

26 B.C.: Death of Gallus and alteration of Georgic IV.

26–24 B.C.: iv. and outline of vi. (present II. and VI.).

24 B.C.: Rejection of ii. iii. and iv. (present II.

¹ See p. 74.

The Stages of Composition

and IV.) read to Augustus. Modification and rejection of i. (present III.).

24-23 B.C.: VI. Perhaps also VII. and VIII.

23 B.C.: Death of Marcellus. VI. read to Augustus.

23-19 B.C.: IX.-XII. V. Revision.

It is more difficult to form a theory as to dates in the case of the later books than in that of the earlier ones. There are only very slight indications of date, and it is perhaps impossible to arrive at any conclusion. The above arrangement depends on three considerations:

(1) There is no evidence that VII.-XII. were not written in their present order.¹

(2) IX.-XII. are closely connected in subject and style, whereas VII. and VIII. are more like the earlier books.

(3) V. probably belongs to the period of the second revision. Vergil left III. to the end, and would be likely to do the same with the other rejected book.

Thus the order of the books according to their present enumeration is: III., I., IV., II., VI., VII.-XII., V.

It is now at least possible to make some conjecture as to the state of the manuscript with which Varius and Tucca had to deal. That it was to some extent a fair copy is proved by the clearness and good tradition of our present text. It seems most likely

¹ It has been pointed out that there is some evidence for supposing that part of X. is later than XI. and XII. See pp. 91 and 94.

The Growth of the Aeneid

that after writing V. Vergil made a copy on which he could work during the final revision. He kept the manuscript of III. with the other books, no doubt intending to destroy it when the new III. was written; but he had not altered its original number; it was still called i. when the editors found it, a fact which would explain the statement given by Suetonius that Varius changed the order of two books, "et qui tunc secundus erat in tertium locum transtulisse."¹ "Secundus" must be a mistake in the tradition; the Third Book can never have stood second.

The actual text was probably not extensively corrected. If it had been we should have had more survivals of rejected lines and passages, and more difficulties in sense and reading. Servius records only four cases of passages being rejected,² and the

¹ Sueton., 42.

² The four lines originally prefixed to I. and the lines about Helen in II. are the most important. On III. 204 Servius has the following note:

"Hinc Pelopis gentes Maleaeque sonantia saxa
Circumstant, pariterque undae terraeque minantur.
Pulsamur saevis et circumsistimur undis.

"Hi versus circumducti inventi dicuntur, et extra paginam in mundo."

And on VI. 289: "Sane quidam dicunt versus alios hos a poeta hoc loco relictos qui ab eius emendatoribus sublati sint:

"Gorgonis in medio portentum immane Medusae,
Viperae circum ora comae, cui sibila torquent,
Infamesque rigent oculi, mentoque sub imo
Serpentum extremis nodantur vincula caudis."

The Stages of Composition

places where there is real obscurity of sense or reading or both are very few. The editors did their work well, adding nothing, and removing nothing except what Vergil had marked for removal. The Third Book may or may not have been so marked; in any case there was no real disloyalty in publishing it.

Vergil had intended to give three years to the final revision of the *Aeneid*. It is worth while to glance over the work which still remained to be done. The most important task was the rewriting of III., and we may guess within certain limits how the new III. would have run. The account of the departure from Asia would have been lengthened, and the oracles of Apollo, which are referred to later, would have been given here. Aeneas would sail out towards the west following the star of Venus. Perhaps Venus would have appeared herself, and given him counsel. The landing in Thrace belongs to the established legend and must have been included, and the story of Polydorus would no doubt have remained. The consultation of the oracle at Delos was also part of the tradition. The attempt at colonization in Crete would not have been retained; Crete was well known to the Trojans, and they also knew that the land which they were seeking was called Italy. But the vision of Penates, a passage of great beauty, might easily have been retained in a different setting. Whether Aeneas would have visited the Strophades in this new version is doubtful. The fight with the Harpies might have been disso-

The Growth of the Aeneid

ciated from the oracle of the eating of the tables, or Anchises might have given the interpretation of Celaeno's words, which is attributed to him in VII. The meeting with Andromache is extremely beautiful, and would certainly have been included, but the prophecy of Helenus would probably have been considerably shortened; the sign of the white sow at any rate would have disappeared. The Sicilian incidents would have been altered to some extent.¹ The rescue of Achaemenides might have been kept, though it would involve leaving him for five years at least in the country of the Cyclopes, a difficulty which would probably not have troubled Vergil. At the end some account of Acestes and the Trojan settlement must have been added. The book would then have concluded as it does now with the death of Anchises. Many other incidents would certainly have been added, and, most important of all, a sense of a longer time would have been given. Vergil would probably not have been troubled to mark off each separate year of wandering, but he would have

¹ Vergil may have meant to make more of Scylla and Charybdis. In I. 200-1 Aeneas says to his companions:

Vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis
Accestis scopulos.

In VII. 302-3 Juno complains:

Quid Syrtes aut Scylla mihi, quid vasta Charybdis
Profuit ?

The passage in I. is perhaps inconclusive, but Juno's words have not much point when compared with the passing of Scylla and Charybdis in III.

The Stages of Composition

made the reader feel the endless weariness of the six years' voyage.¹

In the other books, so far as we can see, beyond the completing of the unfinished lines and the expansion of certain passages, little needed to be done. In I. the references to Sicily would have to be made clear, and the incorrect date in the last lines removed; in II. the gap left by the removal of the Helen incident must be filled up.² Vergil would have probably altered the beginning of IV. to a certain extent, at least as far as the position of Iarbas in the story is concerned.

V. needed no correction, except that perhaps the account of Nisus and Euryalus in IX. 176-181 would have been put into its natural place here.³ In VI. all that is required is a slight alteration in the story of Palinurus to harmonize it with the account given in V. VII.-XII. probably would have been considerably altered in detail, but very little in general conception.

Finally, it is not to be supposed that the completed Aeneid could necessarily have been free from small difficulties and inconsistencies. Vergil was not writing a chronicle, but a poem, a fact which is too often forgotten. But at the same time it is impossible to suppose that Vergil would not have

¹ It is assumed that a full year would be spent in Carthage.

² Perhaps by a speech of Aeneas, in which he would curse Helen as the cause of the destruction of Troy.

³ See p. 74.

The Growth of the Aeneid

dealt with those inconsistencies which strike the most casual reader, or that he would have admitted at the final revision any part of the poem which fell noticeably below his standard of perfection.

NOTE: SUMMARY OF THE STAGES OF COMPOSITION—*First Stage*, 29 B.C.—Prose sketch of the whole poem: i. Voyage from Asia to Sicily. ii. Events in Sicily. Death of Anchises. iii. Voyage from Sicily to Carthage. iv. Fall of Troy. v. Passion and death of Dido. Voyage to Cumae. vi. Nekyia. VII.—XII. more or less corresponding with the present form.

Second Stage, 29–19 B.C.—Composition of the poem:

(a) 29–26 B.C.—Original i., ii., iii., v. (present III., V., I., IV.). [26 B.C.—Death of Gallus and alteration of Georgic IV.] 26–24 B.C.—Original iv. and outline of vi. (present II. and VI.).

(b) 24 B.C.—First revision. Rejection of original ii. [iii. and iv. (original iv. and v., present II. and IV.) read to Augustus.] Modification and rejection of original i. (present III.).

(c) 24–23 B.C.—VI., VII., and VIII. (?). [23 B.C.—Death of Marcellus. VI. read to Augustus.] 23–19 B.C. (1).—VII. and VIII. (?). IX.—XII.

(d) 23–19 B.C. (2).—V. Revision of the whole poem. [19 B.C.—Death of Vergil.]

Third Stage.—The text published by Varius and Tucca.

The Stages of Composition

This chronology is, of course, almost entirely conjectural, as, indeed, is the whole theory of the stages of composition. But in every case an attempt has been made to give full weight to the external evidence, such as it is, and to put forward a point of view which does not conflict with the accepted tradition.

INDEX OF PASSAGES QUOTED FROM THE WORKS OF VERGIL

	PAGE		PAGE
Ecl. II. 53 ..	10	Aen. III. 458-460	22, 49
Geor. IV. 559-566	104	„ 495 ..	18
Aen. I. 1-7 ..	104-5	„ 500-501	18
„ 25-28 ..	23	„ 521-524	19
„ 31-32 ..	25	„ 679-681	29
„ 34-35 ..	33	„ 684-686	34
„ 92 ..	33	„ 697-698	35
„ 195-197	25	Aen. IV. 1-2 ..	59
„ 200-201	116	„ 43-44 ..	61
„ 382 ..	24	„ 193 ..	40
„ 402-406	10	„ 309-310	40
„ 407-408	24	„ 311-312	20
„ 534 ..	14, 41	„ 345-346	19
„ 559-560	41	„ 351-353	65
„ 636 ..	41	„ 361 ..	61
„ 707-708	35	„ 399-400	61
„ 755-756	25, 63	„ 436 ..	8
Aen. II. 10-13	11, 43	„ 503 ..	61
„ 65-66	44	„ 515-516	61
„ 232-233	11	Aen. V. 82-3 ..	19
„ 241-243	36	„ 83 ..	20
„ 274-275	36	„ 626 ..	26, 63
„ 345-346	9, 44	„ 628-629	20
„ 589-592	25	„ 653 ..	14, 74
„ 726-729	69	Aen. VI. 61 ..	20
„ 780 ..	18	„ 93-94 ..	49
„ 780-784	19	„ 112-114	69
„ 801 ..	24	„ 165 ..	47
Aen. III. 7 ..	17	„ 343 ..	49
„ 8 ..	40	„ 355-356	64
„ 88 ..	17	„ 695-696	65
„ 141 ..	40	„ 834-835	10
„ 255-257	21	„ 835 ..	50
„ 284-285	40	„ 882-883	97
„ 310-312	29	„ 888-892	50
„ 352-355	35	„ 890-892	22
„ 356-357	40	Aen. VII. 116 ..	21

Index of Passages

			PAGE				PAGE
Aen. VII.	124-127	..	21	Aen. X.	491-494	..	92
"	302-303	..	116	"	517-520	..	93
Aen. VIII.	469 ..	..	10	"	580 ..	..	10
"	492-493	..	82	"	604-605	..	88
Aen. IX.	295 ..	..	12	"	791-793	..	84
"	446-449	..	84	Aen. XI.	350-351	..	94
"	536-537	..	42	"	446 ..	..	88
Aen. X.	146-147	..	88	"	741-742	..	94
"	156-158	..	89	Aen. XII.	76-77	..	95
"	215-218	..	89	"	113-114	..	96
"	238-240	..	90	"	648 ..	..	10
"	442-443	..	92				

INDEX

- ACESTA, 68, 71
 Acestes, 25, 33, 68, 116
 Achaemenides, 26, 34, 77, 116
 Achilles, 36, 92, 93
 Aeneas, *passim*
 Aeneid I., 41-3, 32-4, 106
 " II., 43-7, 106, 107
 " III., 16-40
 " IV., 52-63, 106-7
 " V., 63-75, 112
 " VI., 47-52, 107, 111
 " VII., 86-7
 " VIII., 87-8
 " IX., 88
 " X., 88-94
 " XI., 94-5
 " XII., 95-8
 Alba Longa, 22
 Allecto, 71, 86
 Amata, 86
 Anchises, 2, 17, 21, 22, 25, 36,
 50, 63, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 108,
 109, 110, 116
 Andromache, 27, 29
 Anna, 57-9, 60
 Apollo, 23, 49, 64, 73, 102, 107,
 115
 Apollonius Rhodius, 52, 54
 Ascanius, 21, 22, 80
 Augustus, 14, 37, 46, 47, 51,
 84, 87, 109, 110, 111
 Aulus Gellius, 42
 Ausonius, 56

 Battle of Actium, 28, 87
 Battle scenes, 85
 Beroe, 62
 Bethe, E., 44

 Cacus, 28, 78
 Caesura in fifth foot, 93-4
 Camilla, 74, 84, 85, 95
 Carthage, 52-9, 63-6, 68, 106
 Catalogue of Etruscans, 88,
 90; of Latins, 86
 Catullus, 52
 Chronology of III., 25-27, 39-40;
 of V., 63-4; of VII.-XII.,
 79, 98-9
 of composition, 109-13,
 118-9
 Cicero, 49
 Conington, J., 34, 42, 46, 51,
 52, 53, 65, 67, 92
 Conrads, I., 26, 40, 66-7
 Conway, R. S., 11, 48, 51
 Cymodocea, 90

 Dessau, H., 53, 58
 Dido, 19, 29, 35, 43, 52-63, 64,
 65, 69, 72, 97, 106, 107, 108
 Dio Cassius, 80
 Diodorus Siculus, 26, 40
 Dionysius Halicarnasensis, 21,
 22, 26, 39, 71, 80, 81, 82
 Divina Commedia, 6
 Drances, 94
 Donatus, 2

 Euripides, 60
 Euryalus, 69, 74, 84, 112, 117
 Evander, 81, 82, 85, 90, 91, 92

 Fabius Pictor, 49

 Gallus, 31, 109
 Garrod, H. W., 63

Index

- Georgic IV., 31, 47, 83, 104,
 109
 Gercke, A., 13, 17, 30, 48, 58,
 70, 76, 77, 79
 Greek Anthology, 56
 Hector, 29, 36
 Heinze, R., 17, 20, 23, 30
 Helen, 3, 6, 44-6, 114, 117
 Henry, J., 92
 Herodotus, 20
 Homer, 12, 32-3, 85
 Iarbas, 60, 117
 Iliad, 32, 36, 85, 93, 102
 Ilioneus, 19, 41, 86
 Inconsistencies, 2, 6; in I.,
 42-3; in III., 17-28; in V.,
 63-5; in VI., 51-2; in IX.,
 88; in X., 88-93; in XII.,
 95-6
 Inserted pages, 7, 11, 18, 36,
 38, 43, 50, 90, 96
 Julius Caesar, 51
 Juno, 23, 33, 71, 102, 105, 106,
 116
 Juppiter, 54, 60, 82; Indiges,
 59
 Juturna, 82, 91
 Karsten, H. T., 19, 21
 Kettner, G., 67, 71
 Landor, W. S., 6
 Laocoon, 7, 11, 43-4
 Latinus, 55, 79, 80, 81, 95
 Latium, 18-9, 68, 79, 86, 107
 Lausus, 69, 80, 81, 84, 85, 91,
 93, 94
 Lavinia, 50, 79, 80; daughter
 of Evander, 82
 Lavinium, 26, 80
 Libya, 64, 66
 Livy, 80, 81
 Macrobius, 14, 32, 52, 54, 56,
 109
 Marcellus, 47, 111
 Mezentius, 80, 81, 82, 91, 93, 94
 Naevius, 32, 54-56
 Names of Italy, 17
 Napoleon, 85
 Neptune, 64, 72, 73
 Nettleship, H., 2, 17, 45, 53,
 87, 92
 Nisus, 74, 84, 112, 117
 Noack, F., 54
 Numicius, 59
 Obscurity in the Aeneid, 8, 41-
 2
 Odyssey, 20, 23-4, 26, 32, 35,
 48
 Opening lines of I., 3, 104-5,
 114; of II., 43; of III., 105;
 of IV., 59; of VI., 66, 72-3
 Oracles, 19, 21, 23, 49, 64, 73,
 107, 115
 Original form of III., 32-8,
 104-5; of IV., 72-3; of V., 66-
 72, 105, 108
 Ovid, 57-59, 81, 82
 Palinurus, 49, 64, 66, 71-73,
 106, 107, 112, 117
 Pallas, 6, 81, 85, 89, 90, 91, 92,
 93, 96, 97
 Paradise Lost, 62
 Plutarch, 39
 Pompeius Trogus, 53, 55
 Pompey, 51
 Propertius, 87
 Prophecies of Anchises, 21, 22,
 50
 of Cassandra, 17
 of Celaeno, 21, 23, 27,
 116
 of Creusa, 15, 19, 38
 of Helenus, 18, 21-23, 48,
 49, 71, 77, 116
 of the Penates, 17, 23
 of the Sibyl, 22, 49-50
 Prose sketch of the Aeneid, 4,
 100-3

Index

- Rejected passages, 3, 6, 38-9,
 44-47, 105, 108, 110-1, 114
 Revision of the Aeneid, 39,
 107-12, 115-17
 Ribbeck, O., 1, 26, 45, 47, 51,
 67
 Sabbadini, R., 11, 31, 34, 43,
 104
 Scylla and Charybdis, 116
 Segesta, 57-8
 Servius, 3, 8, 9, 22, 24, 32, 37,
 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55,
 57, 66, 72, 80, 81, 82, 89,
 94, 104, 109, 111, 114
 Shakespeare, 9
 Shield of Aeneas, 78, 87
 Sicily, 25, 33, 58, 65, 68, 70,
 71, 108, 117
 Silius Italicus, 57
 Similes in III., 29: in VII.-
 XII., 96
 Stages of composition, 4-5,
 100-19
 Stampini, E., 52
 Suetonius, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 32, 37,
 39, 46, 47, 53, 76, 100, 101,
 103, 104, 109, 111, 114
 Tantalus, 51
 Tarcho, 90, 94-5
 Thucydides, 57-9
 Tiber, 18-9, 22
 Tibullus, 104
 Timaeus, 54, 55
 Trojan camp, 79, 88
 Turnus, 6, 50, 79-82, 84, 85,
 86, 91-2, 94, 95-98
 Unfinished lines, 8-13, 14-5,
 29, 41-2, 44, 49-51, 61, 74-5,
 86-7, 88, 93, 94, 95
 Varius and Tucca, 3, 8, 39, 44,
 45, 66, 113, 114
 Varro, 57-8
 Venus, 23-25, 54, 68, 72, 73,
 102, 106, 107, 115
 Vergil, *passim*
 accuracy, 7-8
 development of technique,
 77-8, 83
 method of composition,
 4-5, 8, 103-4
 Warde Fowler, W., 85, 86, 87,
 91, 95

H23 418 988 8

A CHARGE
IS MADE FOR
REMOVED OR
DAMAGED
LABELS.

